THE True Doctrine OF JUSTIFICATION, IN Two Parts.

BY ANTHONY BURGESS Pastour of *Sutton-Coldfield* Church in WARWICKSHIRE.



LONDON, Printed by *A. M.* for *Tho. Underhill* at the Anchor in *Pauls* Church-yard, near the little North-door. 1655.

The Doctrine of JUSTIFICATION

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

THE True Doctrine OF JUSTIFICATION

Asserted and Vindicated,

FROM

The Errours of PAPISTS, ARMINIANS, SOCINIANS, and more especially ANTINOMIANS.

In XXX. LECTURES Preached at *Laurence-Jury*, LONDON.

PART I.

By *Anthony Burgess*, Preacher of GODS Word.

The third Edition, with the Addition of the Contents of each Section, by a Friend of the Author.



LONDON,
Printed by *A. M.* for *Tho. Underhil.* 1655.

The Doctrine of JUSTIFICATION

Asserted and Vindicated

FROM

The Errours of PAPISTS, ARMINIANS, SOCINIANS, and more especially ANTINOMIANS.

In XXX. Lectures Preached at Lawrence-Jury, LONDON,

PART I.

By Anthony Tuckney, Preacher of Gods Word.

The third Edition, with the Addition of the Contents of each Sermon, by a Friend of the Author.

THOMAS BAKER
39
GOSWELL
ROAD
LONDON
EC
BOOKSELLER

LONDON,
Printed by A. M. for Tho. Parkhurst. 1655.

TO THE

Right Honourable EDWARD

Earle of *Manchester*, Vicount *Mandeville*, Baron of *Kimbolton*.

My Lord,

THE many favours your Honour hath vouchsafed unto me, altogether undeserving, may justly command a publike acknowledgement thereof to the whole world; But that which doth especially encourage me to seek for your Protection

in the publishing of this Treatise, is your unfained love of, and stedfast continuance in the Truth: So that those two things which *Pythagoras* said made a man compleat, ὠφελεῖν τοὺς πλησίον, *to do good to others*, and *to embrace truth*, may without flattery be affirmed to be in your Lordship. And as for the later, *Paul* speaks it as a great commendation, that the *true faith did dwell in Lois*, which denoteth a *stable and firm permanency*, as the Apostle elsewhere saith, *Sinne dwelleth in him*. In some mens breasts, Truth is only a *sojourner*, and their assent to it *passeth away* (as the Psalmist speaks of our life) *like a tale that is told*. Now herein Christ speaks of a peculiar priviledge to the Elect, that it is not possible for them to be deceived by false Prophets *(if it were possible to deceive the very Elect)* which is to be understood of a *totall and finall seduction*: Thus also when the Apostle had mentioned the Apostacy of *Hymenæus* and *Philetus*, he interposeth by way of comfort to the godly, *Nevertheless the Foundation of the Lord standeth sure, having this Seal, the Lord knoweth who are his*; and no wonder if the Truths of Christ are worthy of all hearty acceptation, seeing they are wholly by supernaturall revelation, in which sense, some say, Christ is called ὁ λόγος, *the Word*, because he revealed the will of his Father to us; but in another respect are we to take heed how we decline from the Truths of God, because they are the inlet and first instrument of our Sanctification and Salvation, *God would have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of*

2 Tim. 1.5.

Mat. 24. 24.

2 Tim. 2. 19.

Joh. 1. 1.

1 Tim. 2. 4.
Joh. 1. 7. 17.

the

the truth; *Sanctifie them by thy truth, thy Word is truth*; and our regeneration is described partly by the *renewing of our minde*, for as corrupt distillations from the head are apt to putrifie the vitals, so Errours and false Doctrines do quickly corrupt our practice. One thing more I make bold to recommend to your Lordship, that besides the *bare receiving of the truth*, there is (as the perfection of knowledge) *the acknowledgement of truth after godlinesse*, and *the learning of truth as it is in Jesus Christ*; which is, when the truths we beleeve have a savoury and powerfull effect upon us, and nothing causeth our abode in the Truth so much as the experimentall efficacy of it upon our hearts. *It is good* (saith the Apostle) *to have the heart established with grace and not with meats.* One would have thought the Apostle should have said it is good to have the heart established with *sound Doctrine*, because he exhorteth them not to be carried aside with every winde of Doctrine; but he saith Grace rather then Knowledge, because this is the choicest Antidote against falshoods; *Tantum scimus, quantum operamur*, we know no more (*viz.* savourily, clearly, and stedfastly) then we have powerfull practice of: Now of all supernaturall truths the Doctrine of *Justification* hath no mean excellency, this is the Article which *Luther* said *reigned in his heart*; In this is a Christians treasury of hope and consolation: and because the Antinomians, whose opinions may be styled as those of *Epicurus* were, δογματικαὶ πειρῆνες, (inticing Syrens of a mans fleshly

Tit. 1. 1. Eph. 4. 21. Heb. 13. 9. Eph. 4. 23.

minde) have put their dead flies in this precious Box of oyntment, I have endeavoured to select this precious Gold from their drosse. Though the matter I handle be in part Controversall, yet it is also in a great measure Practicall. The greatest mercy I can wish to your Lordship, is this glorious priviledge of *Justification*, in which only, and not in riches, honours, or any earthly dignity, consisteth true and perfect blessednes, as *David* a King, doth heartily, and with much affection acknowledge, *Psal.* 32. 1. and *Paul* by vertue of this *Justification*, Rom. 8. triumphs over all adversity and trouble whatsoever. Of which glorious happines that your Lordship may be made partaker, is the Prayer of

Your Lordships most humble

Servant in the Lord,

ANTHONY BURGESS.

TO

TO THE
Christian Reader.

Christian Reader,

Were I not already ingaged (I know not how) in this publike way of Controversies, I should wholly decline such service; partly because of that ill fate, (if I may say so) which doth accompany Books through the various Palates of those that reade them, whereby they are unwilling agnoscere quod Dei est, *or* ignoscere quod hominis est; *partly because of expectation, (which is an heavy prejudice) all men judging it reasonable, that now in these later times there being the advantage of all the abilities of those who went before us, a man should not so much* libros, *as* thesauros scribere, *write not Books, but rich Treasuries, as the Heathen said; partly because this Controversall way doth*

so possesse the intellectual part, that the affectionate part is much dulled, and made remiss thereby. Even a Papist, Granada (*in his* way of Devotion) *said, A Learned man that was busied in such kinde of imployment, should reckon himself in the number of those wretched Captives that are* ad metalla damnati, *Though all the day long they dig up Gold, yet they are not any whit inriched by it, but others for whom they work. And* Rodericus (*as I remember*) *relateth of* Suarez, *that he was wont to say, He esteemed that little pittance of time, which constantly every day he set apart for the private examination of his own conscience, more then all the other part of the day, which he spent in his voluminous Controversies.* De perfec.

The Apostle speaks of doting about questions, *but the Greek word* νοσῶν *signifieth to be* sick and languishing, *which doth declare the nature of needless disputations, that they fret away, and make to consume the true power of Godliness. God once only spake out of a thorny bush, and as the Israelites were to go out of the military Camp to gather manna, so must a man shun tedious Disputes, who would injoy the fat and marrow of Christian Religion. But notwithstanding these discouragements, yet the Apostle with a vehement obtestation cals upon* Timothy, *and in him all faithfull Ministers to* preserve that good thing committed to their Charge, *so that it is the duty of Ministers not only by Preaching, but otherwise as occasion serveth, to see that the golden treasure deposited in the Church, be not debased with drossy errors, or the childrens necessary food mingled with destructive poyson. Truth is a* Depositum. 1. Tim. 6. 20. 1. Tim. 6. 10.

Aristotle *doth rationally conclude, That it is a greater injustice to deny a little thing deposited, then a great summe* Probl. Sect. 9. quæ. 2.

that

that we are indebted for, because he that depositeth any thing in our custody, trusteth in us as a faithfull friend; the other expecteth only justice from us. Now of all points of Divinity, there is none that with more profit and comfort we may labour in, then in that of Justification, *which is stiled by some,* articulus stantis & cadentis ecclesiæ, *The Church stands or fals, as the truth of this is asserted, and a modest, sober vindication of this point from contrary errors, will not hinder, but much advantage the affectionate part of a man, even as the Bee is helped by her sting to make hony. Gods way of* Justification *is for the truth of it above natural reason, and therefore here is required a supernaturall Revelation to manifest it. In summ, that the Divine Authority of the Scripture is in nothing more irradiant, then in the discovery of this glorious way of our* Justification. *But it hath been a stumbling block, and a rock of offence to many mens hearts, who look for a Philosophicall* Justification, *or righteousness of works, either wholly issuing from our free will (as they suppose) or partly from it, and partly from the grace of God, and on this hand, have erred the Pelagians, Papists, Arminians and Socinians. But while the Orthodox have been diligent to keep this fountain pure from the filth that Philistims daily threw in, there arose up another error on the right hand, which the Apostle* Paul *in his Epistles doth many times Antidote against, viz. such a setting up of Free-Grace in* Justification, *that should make the Law in to all purposes useless, and while it extolleth priviledges debases duties; That as the Arminians on the one side, think it most absurd that the same thing should be* officium requisitum & donum promissum, *a duty required on our*

part, and yet a gift promised on Gods part; So on the other side the Antinomian cannot at the same time see the fulnesse of Grace, only in blotting out our sins, and yet at the same time, A necessity of repentance, without which this Justification could not be obtained. Hence it is they fix their Meditations and Discourses upon the promissory part of the Scripture, not at the same time attending to the preceptive part. But whether it be their weaknesse or their wilfulnesse, they seem to be upon those passages of Scripture, which speak of Gods grace and Christs satisfaction, as David in Sauls armes, which were an hinderance not an advantage to him. Men destitute of sound knowledge and Learning, should be afraid lest they do στρεβλοῦν, 2 Pet. 3. 16. wrest the Scripture, and that εἰς ἀπώλειαν, to their own destruction. It is no less a sin (saith Oecumenius) to torture the Scripture by perverse interpretation, then it was to torment and crucifie the very bodies of the Apostles: but to see many ignorant men attempting beyond their strength in Controversies of Divinity, hath that fate out, which did to one Lucian speaks of, who finding Orpheus his harp consecrated to Apollo in a certain Temple, bribed the Priest of the Temple, thinking to make the same melody which Orpheus used to do, which he attempting, through his ignorance made such an horrid sound, that it inraged all the dogs neer him, which presently fell on him, and tore him in pieces.

Adversus indoctum.

It is therefore good for men in all humility and modesty not to think of themselves above what they ought, or to affect to be Doctors, before indeed they have been Disciples.

But to my matter in hand, I shall briefly give an account

of

of my method in this Treatise. Whereas in Justification *many things are considerable, the efficient and impulsive Cause,* Gods grace; *the meritorious Cause,* Christs satisfaction; *the instrumentall Cause,* Faith; *and every one of these hath many Debates upon it by Learned men; Yet I have insisted upon that wherein the nature of it doth consist, and because that is made by some two-fold, partly in* remission of sins, *partly in* imputation of Christs righteousnesse, *this Discourse is wholly upon the former, indeavouring to clear all the Doctrinal and Practical doubts that are of greatest consequence in this matter. And if God should blesse this part with any good successe, to establish the mindes of those that waver, I shall (with Gods assistance) proceed to the other point,* viz. *The* Imputation of Christs righteousnesse; *the mistaking of which point is no mean cause of Antinomianism. I am not ignorant, how subject to blindnesse and severall imperfections the best of men are, whereby through after-thoughts, they see such an argument might have been more strongly managed, and such expressions better ordered, insomuch that most men may say, as* Luther *said of his Books, He could (like* Saturn) *eat up his own children: It is also to be considered how difficult it is, with pure ends and godly intentions, aiming only at the glory of God, and edification of others, to undertake such a businesse as this is; therefore in all these exercises, it is good to go out of our selves, depending upon the strength of God only, and not to boast as if we had not received.* Tutius vivitur, quando totum Deo damus, Et in nihilo gloriandum est, quia nihil nostrum est.

One thing more I am to inform thee of, which is, that

in

in the former part of this Treatise, I have more remisly spoken of Justification in the generall (*because that will more pertinently be handled in the other point of* imputed Righteousnes) *and have indeavoured more vigorously to prosecute the other part which is wholly spent about* Pardon of Sin. *These things premised, I leave thee to the Lord, who teacheth his children to profit.*

Thine in Christ Jesus

Anthony Burgess.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

LECT. I.

ROm. 3. 24, 25. *Being Justified freely by his Grace, &c.*

Introductory Propositions, setting forth the Excellency and Preciousnesse of the Doctrine of Justification; Of how much importance it is that it be kept pure; With the signification of the word *Justifie*.

LECT. II.

Of the Reality of Justification by Christ; That the Scripture speaks of it as to us in a Passive sense, and as Gods Action, not ours. And of other equivalent phrases to it in Scripture; With some necessary Cautions.

LECT. III.

The Possibility of Pardon; How many wayes sinne may be said to be forgiven; What things are considerable in sinne; The Difference between Original and Actual sinne; That when sinne is forgiven, it is totally and perfectly forgiven: Also the Subject and Extent of Remission.

LECT. IV.

Of the Afflictions that come upon the Godly after the Pardon of their sins.

LECT. V.

Of Afflictions: Whether God chastiseth his Children for their sins.

LECT. VI.

Jer. 50. 20. *In those daies, and at that time the iniquitie of Judah shall be sought for, and it shall not be found*, &c.

Of the Perfection of Justified Persons, and their freedom from sin: Whether God see sin in Believers: Divers Scripture expressions about pardon of sinne.

Lect. VII.

Arguments to prove, That God doth see sinne in the Justified as to be offended and displeased with it.

Lect. IX.

How greatly God is offended at the sins of those that are Godly.

Lect. X.

How Gods anger manifests it self upon his own Children sinning.

Lect. XI.

Heb. 4. 13. *Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.*

The Antinomians Distinction of Gods *Knowing* and *Seeing sinne*, examined.

Lect. XII.

Propositions shewing how farre Gods taking notice of sinne, so as to punish it, is subject to the meer Liberty of his Will.

LECT. XIII.

Matth. 6. 12. *And forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debters.*

Sheweth, That Sinnes are Debts.

LECT. XIV.

That Juſtified perſons are to pray for the Forgiveneſſe of ſinne in a proper ſenſe, and not only for the ſenſe of pardon: With the meaning of the Petition, *Forgive us*, &c.

LECT. XV.

Shews, What this Petition doth ſuppoſe and imply.

LECT. XVI.

Setteth forth the Nature of ſinne in its ſeveral Names, Definition, Effects and Aggravations.

LECT. XVII.

An Enquiry into the Nature of *Forgiveneſſe of ſinne*. Divers Greek words that expreſſe this Mercy. And the Neceſſity of Faith and Repentance, in order to pardon.

LECT.

LECT. XVIII.

The Neceſſity of *Repentance* in order to Forgiveneſſe: And how it conſiſts with Gods Free-grace in remitting.

LECT. XIX.

Repentance no cauſe of pardon, and yet its Uſefulneſſe and Neceſſity as to Repentance. Why Repentance is not ſufficient to remove the Guilt of Sin; And why it bears not the proportion in Satisfaction that Sin doth in the offence.

LECT. XX.

Whether pardon of ſinne be an immanent or tranſient Act of God: And whether it be Antecedent to our Faith and Repentance. The contrary proved, *viz.* That God doth not juſtifie or pardon us before we Believe and Repent.

LECT. XXI.

The Antinomian Arguments for Juſtification before Faith, anſwered.

LECT. XXII.

More Arguments to prove Juſtification before Faith, anſwered.

Lect. XXIII.

Whether we pray here for pardon, or for assurance of pardon only. Why God sometimes pardons a sinner, and doth not acquaint him with it; with Directions to doubting, tempted people concerning their sinnes.

Lect. XXIV.

Whether in Repentance the difference between great Sinnes and lesse is to be respected.

Lect. XXV.

Psal. 32. 1. *Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sinne is covered.*

Vers. 2. *Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity.*

Of the pardon of Sin under the notion of *covering it.*

Lect. XXVI.

Psal. 51. 9. *Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities.*

Sheweth, That God takes notice of, and is Angry at the sins of *Believers.* The Aggravations of *Davids*, and so of all Believers sinnes. What sinnes Believers may possibly fall into, and yet wherein they differ

differ from the sinnes of other men.

Lect. XXVII.

How farre grosse Sinnes make a breach upon Justification.

Lect. XXVIII.

Whether God in pardoning do forgive all Sins together, as well future as past.

Lect. XXIX.

Acts 3.29. *Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out.*

That full Absolution is not untill the Day of Judgement: Wherein pardon then consists: And whether the Sins of Gods people shall be manifested at that Day.

Lect. XXX.

Luke 7.47. *Wherefore, I say unto thee, Her sinnes which are many are forgiven, for she loved much.*

Tenderness of Spirit, and true Humiliation (not carnal Presumption) the Effect of the Sense of pardon.

OF

The Contents.

other from the flames of other men.

Page 227. XXVII.

How many people Sinner make a brag upon Religion.

Page 228. XXVIII.

Whether God in pardoning do forgive all Sins together, as well Venereal.

OF JUSTIFICATION.

LECT. I.

Introductory Propoſitions, ſetting forth the Excellency and Preciouſneſs of the Doctrine of Juſtification; Of how much importance it is that it be kept pure; With the ſignification of the word Juſtifie.

ROM. 3. 24, 25.

Being Juſtified freely by his Grace, &c.

THE Apoſtle in the words precedent laid down two Propoſitions, to debaſe man and all his works, that ſo he might make way for the exaltation of that grace of Juſtification here ſpoken of. The Coherence.

The firſt Propoſition is, That *By the deeds of the Law no fleſh ſhall be juſtified in his ſight:* Where two things are obſervable,

1. That he cals every man by the word *Flesh*, which is emphaticall to beat down that pride and tumor which was in the Jews.

2. He addeth, *In his sight*, which supposeth that though our righteousnes among men may be very glorious, yet before God it is unworthy. The other Proposition is, That *All come short of the glory of God:* Some do make it a Metaphor from those in a race, who fall short of the prize. Whether by the glory of God, be meant the Image of God, and that righteousnes first put into us, or eternall life, or (which is most probable) matter of glorying and boasting before God, which the Apostle speaks of afterwards, is not much materiall.

The division and opening of the Text.

Now the Apostle having described our condition to be thus miserable, he commends the Grace of God in justifying of us, which is decyphered most exactly in a few words: So that you have in the Text a most compendious delineation of Justification. First, There is the benefit set down, *Being justified.* Secondly, The efficient cause, *Gods grace*; and here we have a two-fold impulsive cause, one inward, denoted in the word *Freely*; the other outward, in the meritorious cause, *Christs death*; which is further illustrated by the *appointment of God for this end*, προέθετο: Some understand this of *Gods manifestation*, as if it were spoken to oppose the propitiatory in the Ark, which was left hidden; some to the whole Polity in the old Testament, which in the Legall shadows, and the Prophets predictions did declare Christ; Others (upon better ground) referre it to the *Decree of God.* This death of Christ is called ἀπολύτρωσις, which denoteth both the action it self, as also the effect and benefit which cometh by it. *Chrysostom* observeth, that it's called *redemption*, and not a simple *emption*, because we were the Lords once, but by our sinnes became slaves to Satan, and now God doth make us his again. In the third place, you have the instrumentall cause, *Faith in his blood:* This is that Hysope that doth sprinkle the blood, though it be contemptible in it self, yet it is instrumentall for a great good; and hereby is denoted, That faith hath a peculiar nature in this work of Justification, which no other grace hath, for none saith Love in his blood, or Patience in his blood.

Lastly,

Lastly, Here is the finall cause, *To declare the righteousnes of God* [a] *for the remission of sinnes past.* [b] Some observe those words *sinnes past*, as implying, no sinne is forgiven till it be committed; it must be past before it can be forgiven: But the Apostle might use this speech in reference to sinnes past before his coming, to shew the efficacy and power of Christs death, that it was not the blood of Rams and Goats, but that of Christ, which could expiate our offences. My intent is to speak of the Benefit first, and then the Causes: The Benefit is Justification: And for the better understanding of this, consider the Propositions following, which will be subservient to clear the nature of it, although the more exact opening of the word, and the nature of it, is to be looked for when we come to speak of imputed righteousnes.

[a] In what sense righteousnes is taken here, See *Lect.* 12.

[b] Whether πάρεσις be so well translated remission of sin, as indulgence & connivence, as *Beza* renderech it, you have largely discussed *Lect.* 12.

Propositions clearing the nature of Justification.

I. The doctrine of Justification ought to be kept pure,

First, *It is of great consequence to have this Doctrine kept pure. Luther* called it, *Articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ*, as if this were the *soul* and *pillar* of Christianity. *Pighius*, though a Papist, calleth this the *chief part of Christian Doctrine*, confessing that it had been obscured, rather then cleared by their own Writers: yea, this Doctrine about Justification, is that which discerneth the Orthodox from Pagans, Papists, Socinians, and Arminians. Now there are divers reasons why we should keep the Philistims from throwing in earth to stop up this pleasant spring: As 1. Because herein is the grace and good favour of God especially revealed. Therefore the Gospel is called *glorious*, because God did not so much exalt and manifest his excellency in creating the world, as he did in providing of a Saviour, and Pardon for a poor sinner: Hence it's called the *riches of his Grace*, rather then of power or righteousnes. We are therefore solicitous (whatsoever the Antinomians say to the contrary) that the Doctrine of Gods Grace in Justification may be fully improved to the uttermost, and that every broken heart may be put into a ravishment and admiration of it. We bewail those times of Popery, when the Name and efficacy of Christ and his Grace were obscured, by the works and pretended righteousnes of men. 2. It's very necessary to keep this pure, because of the manifold truths that must fall, if this fall; if you erre in this, the whole truth about Originall sinne, Free-will,

And why.

and obligation of the Law will likewise perish. 3. It's of great influence into practice; for what doth the heart smitten for sinne, and filled with the displeasure of God, but runne to this Doctrine as the City of refuge? This is the water their souls pant after, this is the bread that their fainting stomacks would gladly feed on: now if this water be turned into mud, if this bread be made into stones by the corrupt Doctrines of men, how must the soul perish for want of sustenance?

II. Satan hath endeavoured the corrupting of it.

Secondly, *Satan hath endeavoured severall waies the corrupting of it.* You may judge of the preciousnes and excellency of it, by Satans malicious endeavours to suppres it: *Herod* not more diligently seeking to take away the life of Christ, while he was in the Cradle, then Satans instruments were busie to stifle this truth in the infancy. *Chemnitius* relateth, that he did *sæpè cohorrescere*, many times tremble when he thought of a speech which *Luther* would often say (and it was ominous) *That after his death the Doctrine of Justification would be corrupted*: And indeed when those first Reformers had made the body of this Truth in all the severall parts of it, like that of *Absaloms*, comely and beautifull, without any blemish, there presently rose up many perverted in minde, and set upon it, as those thieves upon the man going to *Jericho*, leaving it wounded, and half dead. There are errours about the very nature of it, making it to be *the infusion of righteousnes in us*, for which God doth accept us: Thus they speak of Justification, as *Aristotle* would about Physicall motions. Some take away the *imputation of Christs righteousnes*; some take away the *satisfaction of Christ*; some make *Faith* to be accounted for righteousnes; some make such a Justification, that thereby *God shall see no sinne in those that are justified, whatsoever they do.* Thus in the *nature, parts, instrument, consequents*, and *subject*, here are manifold errors, and hereby Satan bringeth much mischief to the Church, for by this means our lives are spent in disputing about this benefit, when it were far more comfortable to be enjoying of it. And when Satan could not overthrow the Truth by mingling of our works with the Grace of God, as in Popery, then he bendeth himself to errors on the right hand, by setting it up in such a seeming way, by amplifications of it, that

Loc. Com. de Justific.

that thereby all repentance and godly humiliation shall be quite evacuated: Even as we see the devil, when he could not by his instruments, the Pharisees, disprove the Deity of Christ, then he sets instruments on work to confess that he was the Son of God, thereby to get in some errors.

III. God in the way of Justification, goes above our thoughts and reason.

Thirdly, *God in this way of Justification goeth above our thoughts.* And certainly when a Christian will set his heart to think about this Truth, he must lay this for a foundation, that, *In this matter of justifying, Gods thoughts and his thoughts do differ as much as heaven and earth*; so that the Doctrine of Christs Hypostaticall Union is not more above our thoughts and expectation in the truth of it to be believed, then that of Justification is above our hearts, in the goodness of it, to be imbraced. It is in this case with us, as with *Sampson*, who found hony in the Carkase of a Lion, this could not be expected, how could it come there? Had he found it in some holes of a tree in the Wood, where Bees will sometimes Hive themselves, there had been some probability, but here is none: Thus thinketh the soul troubled to finde this hony of Justification in the death of Christ, how unlikely is it? if I should look for it in the works I do, in my holiness and righteousness that is wrought by my own hands, this were according to rules of righteousness.

And this is the ground of all that dangerous error in Popery, they look upon it as against the principles of reason, that we should be accounted righteous any other way, then by that which is *inherent* in us; and this made *Luther* profess, that when he did rightly understand the Doctrine about free remission of sins, yet he was exceedingly troubled with the word *Justifie*, for that old opinion had much soaked into him, that it must be *to make righteous*, as *sanctificare* is to make holy, or *calefacere* to make hot; some positive quality to be brought into a man, which he might oppose against the judgment of God. And hereby you may see, that its no wonder, if the people of God are so difficultly perswaded of their Justification; if they be again and again plunged into fears about it; because this way which God taketh is above our thoughts: It is a great matter to deny our own righteousness, and to be beholding to Christ only for pardon.

IV. The Scripture hath proper words to express this doctrine by.

Fourthly, *As the Doctrine it self is by peculiar revelation, so the Scripture hath proper words to express it by, which we must wholly attend to.* This would be a good Pillar and Cloud to direct us; for then men began to decline from the truth, when they left off a diligent search of the use of the word in the Scriptures. What makes it so confidently and generally asserted by Papists, that Justification is a *transmutation*, a change from the state of unrighteousnes, to the state of holines, but only neglect of the Scripture-use of this word?

And though this matter was agitated seven moneths in the Councill of *Trent*, yet because they did not follow the Starre of the Scripture, they came not to the lodging where Christ was. There are some kinde of words, which the Scripture takes from the common use and custom amongst men, and they are to be interpreted, as commonly they are taken; but then there are other words, which the Scripture doth peculiarly use, as being subservient to express that peculiar matter, which the holy Ghost only teacheth, and such is this word, *to justifie*, for the Greek word δικαιῶν, is observed by learned men to have two significations, one to *punish a man*, or *condemn him*, which is clean contrary to the Apostle his use of the word; or else to *determine and judge a thing as just*, but then it doth not come up to the Apostles meaning; for he speaks of *persons*, but the Grecians use it of *things* themselves: Thus the word *justificare* is not used by any approved humane Authors, no more then *sanctificare*, and *glorificare*. As therefore we must go to the Scripture only for the knowledge of the nature of the thing, so we must express it in such words as the holy Ghost useth; and this is the ground which hath made our Learned men call upon all to consider the Grammaticall use of the words in this matter.

1. Justification implies an accounting just.

1. *The word doth imply an accounting just:* And this is acknowledged by the Papists themselves, as more frequent, though they plead much for such a sense, as *to make just*. Now the truth is, there needs not much quarrell even about that signification, though the Scripture doth not manifest it: For we confess, that he is *made just*, who is *justified*, and that not only in respect of the *inward renovation* of a man, but also in respect

spect of *Justification*; for God doth not account him just who is not so; and certainly to esteem a man just without righteousnes, is as absurd, as to account a man Learned without Learning, or the wall white without whiteness; only we say This righteousnes that doth make a man just, is not *inherent* in him, but *reckoned to him* by the *satisfaction of another*: for a man is *accounted righteous* two waies, either when he is *not guilty* of the crime charged upon him, or when he doth *make satisfaction*; and in this later sense by Christ we become righteous.

2. To make righteous.

2. So that if the word should signifie as much as *to make righteous*, as to *sanctifie* doth signifie to *make holy*, still we could grant it, though not in the Popish way; and indeed the Apostle *Rom.* 5. saith, *many are made righteous by the second Adam*, which if not meant of *inherent* holiness, doth imply that the righteousnes we have by Christ is not meerly *declarative*, but also *constitutive*; and indeed one is in order before the other, for a man must *be righteous*, before he can be *pronounced* or *declared* so to be. But the Hebrew word doth not signifie this sense primarily; for whereas the Hebrew word in *Cal* doth signifie to *be righteous* by a positive quality; The word in *Hiphil*, according to that Rule in Grammar, signifieth to *attribute* and *account this righteousnes unto a man by some words, or other testimony*, even as the word that in *Cal* signifieth to *be wicked*, doth in *Hiphil* signifie to *condemn* and *judge a man as wicked*, so that there are these two things in justifying, whereof one is the ground of the other; first to *make righteous*, and then to *pronounce* or *declare* so.

3. To deal with as a just man.

From these two followeth a third, which is *to deal with a man so justified as a just man*, so that condemnation, crimes, reproach, and fear shall be taken away from him. This declareth the admirable benefit of being justified before God, for when this is done, *Rom.* 5. 1. *We have peace with God*, Ephes. 3. *We come with boldness into his presence*, and open face; so that unbelief and slavish fears in the godly are great enemies to this grace of Justification; yea, they are a reproach and dishonour to it. Thou thinkest if thy heart were not conscious to sin, if nothing but holiness were in thee, thou wouldst be bold, thou wouldst

not fear or be troubled, but thou doest not consider that God walketh towards thee as a righteous man, looketh upon thee as so, so that if Christ be bold thou mayest; if God will not reject Christ, or thy sins cannot condemn him, so neither will God reject thee, or shall thy sins overwhelm thee; this is the sweet consolation of the Gospel, to a sinner broken-hearted, who would give a world for a perfect righteousnes, to make him accepted.

4. It is a judiciall word.

4. *This is a judiciall word, and taken from Courts of Judgement.* It is good to consider this also, for this supposeth God as a just Judge offended, and man summoned to his Tribunal to appear before it. This work of Justification may be excellently compared with that parable, *Mat.*18. Where a man *owing many talents* to his master, is called upon to pay them, and although the servant prayed his Master *to have patience, and he would pay him all,* (which we cannot say) yet, it is said, his Master *forgave him all the debt.* That the word is a *judiciall* word in the generall appeareth, *Deut.*25.1. where the Scripture speaketh of a *controversie between men* brought to judgement, and the Judge *justifying the righteous,* so 2 *King.*15.4. There *Absolom* wisheth *he were Judge in the Land that he might justifie him who brought his case to him*; so *Psal.*51. *That thou maiest be justified, and overcome when thou art judged:* As it is thus in generall, so in this particular case, it is a word taken from Courts of Judgement: thus, *Rom.*3. *That every mouth might be stopped, and the whole world be* ὑπόδικος *guilty.*

Hence there is an *Accuser,* and our sinnes called *debts,* and the opposite to this *justification* is *condemnation,* and the Apostle calleth it *a charge* that is laid upon men. Therefore Christ is called an *Advocate,* and he is said *to make intercession*; all these expressions denote a *Judiciary proceeding*: Thus *David, Enter not into judgement with thy servant, for in thy sight no man shall be justified,* Psal.143. and *Paul,* 1 Cor.4.3. *It is a very small thing to be judged of mans judgement,* where a mans judgement is called a day, according to the Cilician phrase, (as *Jerom* saith) and having spoken this, he addeth something of his Justification before God; so that there is nothing clearer then that the word is a *judiciall word,* and with *John* who in his Epistles

Epistles never uses the word *justifie*, the sense of it is expressed, by *not to come into Judgement*, or to be *translated from death unto life*. And certainly, if to *justifie* were to *make righteous inherently*; it would not be *an abomination in that sense to justifie the Wicked*.

Fifthly, *There can be properly no Justification, but where there is accusation, or a charge:* Therefore condemnation is opposite to it. Hence it is that though it be said that Angels and *Adam* were justified, and that by works, yet if we would speak properly, they were no more justified, then they had an Advocate or Intercessor. Thus when Christ is said to be justified in the Spirit, that is, declared to be the Sonne of God by the Spirit; that is spoken in reference to those calumnies and reproaches that were cast upon him: so that this consideration may comfort a godly man even in that particular wherein he is most troubled; for thus the godly argue, My heart chargeth me with such folly, and so the devil doth, Oh it is too plain, I cannot dissemble it, I cannot hide it; Oh what shall I do? even this very thing may support; for how could there be Justification, if there were not a charge? What need a Christ to justifie, if there were no fault?

V. There can be no Justification but where there is accusation.

Sixtly, *No man can do any thing, whereby he should be accounted just before God.* This is the grand Truth that is such a stumbling block to the world; this makes the Papist gibe and scoff; this makes God (say they) to dissemble; this makes him a liar, to account that ours, which is his Sonnes; who will say a lame *Vulcan* goeth upright with another mans legs? who will compare some deformed *Thersites* to a fair *Absalom*, because of some imaginary beauty which is not in him? But the Scripture is too plain, 2 *Cor.* 5. to be eluded, *Ipse factus est peccatum, sicut nos justitia non nostra sed Dei, nec in nobis sed in ipso, sicut ipse factus est peccatum non suum sed nostrum, nec in se, sed in nobis constitutum.* He is made sin as we are righteousnes, not our righteousnes, but the righteousnes of God, not in us but in him: as he was made sinne, not his own, but ours, not in himself, but in us. Neither do we say, we are made righteous without a righteousnes, that indeed were absurd, but we say it is not in us.

VI. No man can do any thing whereby to be accounted just before God.

VII. We are made just only by Christ.

Seventhly, *That righteousnes whereby we are made just, is only by Christ*; of this more hereafter; only the Scripture doth carry us alwaies from our own righteousnes to that of Faith, which is by his blood; this made *Bernard* say, *Quid tam ad mortem, quod morte Christi non salvetur? Meum meritum est miseratio Domini, non plane sum meriti inops quamdiu ille misericordiarum non fuerit inops.* Though we want, Christ doth not want: though we sinned away our good, yet not Christ his merits: And if a man were made perfectly holy, yet he could not be justified for all that, but he needs a Christ to satisfie for his former transgressions.

VIII. Terror and comfort in the word Justification.

Eighthly, *This description of Justification in a judiciall way containeth much terrour, and also much comfort.* It is good for a Christian to meditate, why God describes the way of pardon by these tearms; And first it may be to rouse up secure and Epicurean consciences. Thy heart will not alwaies be quiet, neither will thy sinne alwaies lie still at the door, but it will awaken thee, and hale thee to judgement. O the terrour thy soul will then be put into! And as it doth thus terrifie, so it doth the more comfort; nothing is so welcome as a pardon after a man is condemned, and his head laid upon the block: Thus when all this charge is laid upon thee, and thou summoned before the tribunall, how precious must grace then be to thee?

Lect. II.

Of the Reality of Justification by Christ; That the Scripture speaks of it as to us in a Passive sense, and as Gods Action, not ours. And of other equivalent phrases to it in Scripture. With some necessary Cautions.

Rom. 3. 24,25.

Being Justified freely by his Grace, &c.

IX. The reality of this Justification.

THe ninth Proposition is, concerning the *reality* and *truth* of this Justification, for when we say, *God doth justifie*, that is, *account* and *pronounce righteous*, this is taken by Papists, as if here were nothing, but a meer fiction and imagination, without any truth indeed: Therefore the godly are for their comfort to know, that this Justification of theirs, is no lesse a real and solid foundation for comfort (yea it is more) then if they had the most perfect and compleat *inherent righteousnesse* that could be: for all things that are *constitutive* of this Justification are real; God his gracious accounting, and esteeming of us so, is real; and seeing he is most Wise, Just and Holy, what he doth judge must needs be so; we many times justifie our selves, but then it is sometimes a meer opinion, we are indeed condemned at that present, but it cannot be so with God. Again, the *foundation* of this Justification, is as solid and firm

as any rock, it being the righteousnesse of Christ, if therefore the righteousnesse of Christ be not a fancy or imagination, no more is this. And lastly, the *effects* of this are real, *viz.* deliverance from wrath, peace with God, joy in the holy Ghost, and the spirit of Adoption. Now in this treasure the godly heart may much enrich himself; he is not in a dream when his soul is ravished with this priviledge; thou mayest be in this transfiguration, and say, *It is good for us to be here*, and still know what thou sayest; What shame then is it to thee, when if thou hadst *inherent* perfect righteousnesse, thou wouldst bid *thy soul take her spiritual ease, for she hath much good stored up for her*, and thou canst not do this upon an *imputed righteousnesse? Imputed righteousnesse* and *inherent*, differ only in the manner, not in reality: It is all one as to Gods glory, and as to thy comfort, whether righteousnesse be thine *inherent*, or thine *imputed*, if it be a true real righteousnesse.

X. The Scripture speaks of Justification as to us in a passive sense.

Tenthly, *Consider the Scripture speaks of this Justification, as to us, still in a passive sense, We are justified*, and that whether it speaks upon a supposition of Justification by works of the Law, or in an Evangelical manner; and this it doth to shew, that God only doth justifie: for sin is only against him, and therefore none but himself can remit his own offence. Besides, none can condemn but God, therefore none can justifie. Who can lay trouble on thy soul, binde thee in chains, and throw thee into hell, but God? and who but God can command all the tempests and waves in thy troubled soul to be still? When therfore others are said to justifie, that is only to be understood *declaratively*, and no more. Now this particular may suppresse all those proud pharisaical thoughts in us, whereby we are apt to be puffed up within our selves: what if we justifie our selves and clear our wayes? yet if God doth not, we remain still obnoxious, and bound in Gods wrath.

Again, It is for comfort to the godly, what though Satan, thy own heart, and the world doth condemn thee? yet if God justifie, thou mayest rejoyce; you see *Rom.*8. what a challenge *Paul* there makes, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? It is God that justifieth.* Who shall charge any thing? The devil, thy own heart, can lay much pride, hypocrisie, slothfulnesse

slothfulnesse to thy charge, It is true, but God through Christ doth justifie. What a Cordial and reviver would it be to Gods people, to live in the power of this gift bestowed upon them? It is God that justifieth thee, O my troubled soul! who can then condemn? who can hinder it, or invalidate it? Certainly we are therefore in dejections, despondencies, and perplexities often, because we drink not of this water of life. Lay and apply this excellent Doctrine, to thy fainting, dying soul, and it will become to it, like *Elisha* applying himself to the dead childe, cause spirit and life again to return to him; right thoughts here, will sweeten all thoughts in other things.

XI. God in justifying, considered as a fatherly Judge.

Eleventhly, *Although Justification be a Court action, and drawn from Judicatories, yet God is not in this action, considered meerly as a Judge, but as* Paternus Judex, *a Fatherly Judge, having an admirable temperament of Justice and Mercy*, so that God pronounceth this sentence from the Throne of Justice and Mercy also; of Justice, in that he will not absolve till satisfaction be made, and he will not pronounce righteous, but where there is a perfect righteousnesse: Therefore that opinion, of making *Faith to be accepted of for Righteousnesse*, is a dangerous and false Assertion. God in this work of Justification, is never described, as accepting of an imperfect righteousnesse for a perfect. No, God doth not cease to be just, while he is thus gracious. Again, his Justice and Righteousnes is herein seen, that none shall be justified, but such sinners who feel their guilt, and desire to be eased of that burden, beleeving and rolling their souls upon him. It is very hard to give the right order of the benefits of Vocation, Justification, Adoption and Sanctification; but yet this may be made good against the *Antinomian*, That a man is not justified, till repenting and believing. Here is Justice then, but there is also a great deal of Grace and Mercy; As in the accepting of a Surety for us, that he would not keep to the Law, of having us in our own persons to pay the utmost farthing, This was great love; So likewise to finde out a way for our Reconciliation; that when the Devils had no remedy provided for them, we have. Further, that when this prize is laid down, we have the application of

this benefit, and so many thousands have not. Two in a Bed, in a Family, in a Parish, one justified, and the other condemned; what Grace is this?

XII. Justification in Scripture described by Gods actions, not ours.

Twelfthly, *This grand Mercy is described in Scripture by God his giving something to us, not our doing any thing to him.* It is described by Gods actions, and not ours to him, which may abundantly satisfie the heart against all doubts and fears; Thus the Scripture cals it *forgiving, not imputing sinne, imputing righteousnesse, making righteous*, all which are actions from God to us, not ours to him, so that we are no where said in a good sense to justifie our selves, or commanded to it, as we are to repent or beleeve, and to crucifie the lusts of the flesh, because it is wholly *Gods action*: by faith indeed we apprehend it, but it is *Gods action*, as the window letteth in the light, but it is the Sunne that doth enlighten. And from this particular, we may gather much comfort, for when we look into our selves and see no such righteousnesse, or holinesse, that we dare hold out to God, then we may remember, this is not by our doing to God, but receiving from him; and in this sense, it is more blessed for us to receive then to give. This made the Father say, *Justitia nostra, est indulgentia tua*, Our righteousnesse, is thy indulgence. Therefore let not the troubled heart say, Where is my perfect repenting? Where is my perfect obedience? but rather ask, Where is Gods forgiving? Where is Gods not imputing? How hardly is the soul drawn off from resting in it self? it is not *thy doing*, but *Gods doing*; thou must not consider what do I, but what God doth. The *Antinomian* he indeed wringeth these brests of Consolation, till bloud cometh, but the true sweet milk of the Word must not therefore be thrown away. Do not then as they sought for Christ, look for him in the grave, when he was risen out thence. Do not thou poar in thy self for this treasure, when it is to be looked for from Heaven; duties, graces will say, This is not in me.

XIII. The Scripture hath phrases equivalent to this of Justification. Psal. 32. 1, 2.

Lastly, *The Scripture hath other equivalent phrases to this of Justification, which likewise do amplifie the comfort of this gift.* It is called *Blessednesse*, as if this indeed were the true Heaven and happinesse. If thou art justified, thou carriest Heaven about

about with thee, and thy name may be Legion, for many are the mercies that do fill thee. Nothing can make thee blessed but this, It is not *Blessed is he* to whom the Lord giveth many riches, and honours, many parts and abilities, *but to whom the Lord imputeth no sinne*; and howsoever those who wallow in a *Laodicean* fulnesse, judge not this such blessednesse, yet, ask a *Cain*, ask a *Judas*, demand of the tormented in hell, Whether it be not a blessed thing to have sin pardoned? That thou shouldest be able to look on thy sins as so many Serpents without stings, as so many *Egyptians* dead upon the shoar, as if they had never been; that thou shouldst be able to say, Lord, Where are such lusts, such sins of mine? I finde them all cancelled: Is not this blessednesse indeed?

Another expression is of *accepting us in Christ*, and herein lieth much of Justification, That it is an acceptation of us to eternal life, *Ephes.* 1.6. This must needs embolden and encourage the heart, when it knoweth, that both person and duties are accepted; though so much frailty and weaknesse, yet God will receive thee. The third phrase is to *make just*, Rom. 5.9. For God doth not pronounce that man just, which is not so. Therefore when we are justified, this is not absolutely and simply against a righteousnesse of works, but in a certain respect, as done by us, and as obedience coming from us, and this must needs support the soul: for when Satisfaction is made, when God hath as much as he desireth, why should not this quiet the heart of a man? Will nothing content thee, unlesse thou thy self art able to pay God the utmost farthing? A fourth word is, *not imputing of sinne*, or *imputing righteousnesse*, and this, as you heard before, is a very sure and reall thing, though it be not in us, for there are many reall benefits do come to us, when yet the foundation is extrinsecal, as when a mans debt is discharged by his Surety, he hath his reall benefit, is discharged, and released out of prison, as if it had been his own personal paiment. Now when God doth this, he goeth not against that Text, To justifie the ungodly, for it is an abomination to do so, because it is against Law: but when God doth not impute sinne, because of the Satisfaction of Christ intervening, that is most consentaneous and agreeable

agreeable to Justice. There is one word more equivalent, and that is *Reconciliation*; Some indeed make this an *Effect of Justification*; Some make *Reconciliation* the *general*, and *Remission of sinne* a *particular* part; but we need not be curious, where Justification is, there is *Reconciliation*; and this doth suppose, that those who were at discord before, are now made friends, and where can friendship be more prized then with God?

Cautions concerning Justification.

Having laid down these introductory Propositions, which describe most of the matter, or nature of Justification, I shall now come to shew, wherein it doth particularly consist, wherein the true nature is, onely let me premise two or three Cautions.

I. *Caution.* First, *We must not confound those things, which may be consequent or concomitant to Justification, with Justification it self*; for many things may necessarily be together, and yet one not be the other: so Justification is necessarily joyned with Renovation, yet a man is not justified in having a new nature put into him: The water hath both moistnesse, and coldnesse in it, yet it doth not wash away spots as it is cold, but as it is moist. We will not enter into dispute (as some of the Schoolmen have, and concluded affirmatively) Whether God may not accept of a sinner to eternal life, without any inward change of that mans heart: It is enough that by Scripture we know he doth not.

II. *Caution.* Secondly, *To place our Justification in any thing that is ours, or we do, is altogether derogatory to the righteousnesse and worth of Christ.* Some there are who place it partly in *our righteousnesse*, and partly in the *Obedience of Christ*, supplying that which is defective in us; Some of late have placed it in our *Faith*, as if that were our righteousnesse, and not for any worth, or dignity of Faith, but God out of his meer good pleasure (say they) hath appointed *Faith* to be that to *man fallen*, which *universall righteousnesse* would have been to *Adam*: and hence it is, that they will not allow any trope, or metonymy in that phrase, *Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for righteousnesse*. But here appeareth no lesse pride or arrogancy in this, then the opinion of the Papists, and

in

in some respects it doth charge God worse, as is to be shewed in handling of that point: Therefore let us take heed, how by our distinctions we put any thing with Christs righteousnesse in this great work.

Thirdly, *In searching out the Nature of Justification, we must not only look to the future, but that which is past.* For suppose a man should be renewed to a full perfection in this life, yet that absolute compleat holinesse could not justifie him from his sins past. Those committed before would still presse him down, though he were now for the present without any spot at all. Therefore though now there were no defects, no frailties in thee, yet who shall satisfie the Justice of God for that which is past, though there were but the least guilt of the least sinne? there is no *Samson* strong enough to bear the weight of it, but Christ himself. III. *Caution.*

Fourthly, The Orthodox sometimes make the nature of Justification in *remission of sin*; sometimes in *imputation of Christs righteousnesse*, which made *Bellarmine* charge them, though falsly, with different opinions, for some make these the same motion: its called *Remission of sinne*, as it respecteth the *term from which*; but *Imputation of righteousnesse*, as it respecteth the *term to which*; even, say they, as the same motion is the expulsion of darknesse, and the introduction of light. But I rather conceive them different, and look upon one, as the ground of the other; *Remission of sinne*, grounded upon the *imputation of Christs righteousnesse*, so that *his righteousnesse imputed to us*, is supposed to be in order before *sinne forgiven*; and although among men where *righteousnesse is imputed*, or a man *pronounced just*, there is, or can be no *remission of sinne*, yet it is otherwise here, because *righteousnesse is not so imputed unto us*, as that it is *inherent in us*,; so among men the more a man is forgiven the lesse he is justified, because forgivenesse supposeth him faulty, yet it is not so in our Justification before God. IV. *Caution.*

Lastly, *We must not confound Justification with the manifestation, and declaration of it in our hearts and consciences.* This is the rock at which the *Antinomian* doth so often split, he sup- V. *Caution.*

poseth Justification to be from all eternity, and that therefore a man is justified before he doth believe; Faith onely justifying by evidence and declaration to our consciences: but this is to confound the Decree of God, and its execution, as shall be proved. Hence it is a dangerous thing, though some excellent men have done it, to make Faith a full perswasion of our Justification, for this supposeth Justification before Faith; It is one thing to be justified, and another thing to be assured of it. It is true, we cannot have any peace and comfort, nor can we so rejoyce in, and praise God, though we are justified, unlesse we know it also.

LECT.

Lect. III.

The Poſſibility of Pardon; How many wayes ſinne may be ſaid to be forgiven; What things are conſiderable in ſinne; The Difference between Originall and Actuall ſinne; That when ſinne is forgiven, it is totally and perfectly forgiven; Alſo the Subject and Extent of Remiſſion.

Rom. 3. 24, 25.

Being Juſtified freely by his Grace, &c.

Juſtification conſiſteth in theſe two particulars, *Remiſſion of ſinne*, and *Imputation of righteouſneſſe:* Indeed here is diverſity of expreſſions among the Learned, as you have already heard: Some thinking the whole Nature of Juſtification to be onely in *Remiſſion of ſinne*, and therefore make it the ſame with *Imputation of righteouſneſſe:* Others, *make one the ground of the other:* Some make *imputation of righteouſneſſe*, the *efficient or meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification*; and *Remiſſion of ſinne*, the onely *form* of our Juſtification: Others make

Juſtification conſiſts in remiſſion of ſin, and imputation of righteouſneſſe.

Remission of sin, the *effect* only of Justification. But howsoever we call these two things, yet this will be made plain, That God in Justification vouchsafeth these two priviledges to the person justified; First, He *forgiveth his sins*; Secondly, *He imputeth righteousnesse*, or rather, this later is the ground of the former, as I shew'd before.

How Justification can be said to be pardon of sin. Answer.

That Justification is *remission of sins*, is generally received, the great Question is about *Imputation of Christs righteousnesse*, (but of that afterwards) onely here may be a doubt, How we can properly say, That Justification is *pardon of sinne*, for a man is not justified, in that he is *pardoned*, but rather it supposeth him *guilty*: It is true, *Remission of sinne* doth suppose a man *faulty in himself*, but because Christ did *take our sins upon him*, and we are *accepted of through him*, as our *Surety*, therefore may *remission of sinne* be well called Justification: Indeed *pardon* can never be called an *inherent righteousnesse*, or a *qualitative Justice* (but rather it opposeth it) but it may be called a *legal* or *judicial righteousnesse*, because God for the *Obedience* and *Satisfaction* of Christ, doth *account of us as righteous*, having *pardoned our sin*, and withall imputing Christs righteousnesse to us, both which make up our Justification.

Propositions for the understanding of remission of sins

For the understanding therefore of the first particular (viz.) *Remission of sinnes*, take these Propositions, which will be the foundation upon which many material Questions will be built.

I. That forgivenesse of sin is possible.

1. *That forgivenesse of sin is possible, there may be, and is such a thing.* Hence in that ancient Creed, we are said to *believe a remission of sins*, where faith is described, not in the meer *historical Acts* of it, but *fiducial*, the *remission of my sins*. Now this is some stay to a troubled sinner, that his sins may be forgiven, whereas the devils cannot; God no where saying to them, *Repent and believe*. And although *Salmeron* holdeth, *That God gave the lapsed Angels space to repent, before they were peremptorily adjudged unto their everlasting torments*; yet he hath scarce a guide or companion in that opinion; were not therefore this true, that there is such a thing in the Church of God, as *forgivenesse of sin*, How much better had it been for us, if we had never been born?

Vide Gerard. in 2. Epist. Pet.

2. Consi-

2. Conſider, *That a ſin may be ſaid to be forgiven divers wayes:* Firſt, in the *Decree and purpoſe of God*, as Chriſt is called, *The lamb ſlain from the beginning.* Though I do not know where the Scripture uſeth ſuch an expreſſion, yet the *Antinomians* build much upon it. Secondly, A ſin may be ſaid to be forgiven *in Chriſt meritoriouſly*, when *God laid the ſinnes of his people upon him*, which the Prophet *Iſaiah* doth deſcribe as plainly, *Iſa.* 53. as any Evangeliſt; hence ſome have called *Iſaiah* the fifth Evangeliſt. Now you muſt not conclude, ſuch a mans ſinnes are *pardoned*, becauſe they are *laid upon Chriſt a long while ago*, which is the *Antinomians* perpetual panalogizing; for to this *effect of remiſſion of ſinne*, there go more cauſes beſides the *meritorious*, faith the *inſtrumental cauſe*, which is as neceſſary in its kinde for this great benefit, as the *meritorious cauſe* is in its kinde, that though Chriſt hath born ſuch a mans ſinnes, yet they are not pardoned till he do believe; for as the Grace of God, which is the *efficient cauſe* of pardon, doth not make a ſinne compleatly forgiven, without the *meritorious cauſe*; ſo neither doth the *meritorious* without the *inſtrumentall*, but there is a neceſſity of the preſence, and the cooperation of all theſe. Thirdly, A ſin is ſaid to be *pardoned, when the guilt is taken away*, and this is properly *remiſſion of iniquities.* Fourthly, *Sinne is pardoned* in *our ſenſe and feeling, when God takes away all our fears and doubts, giving us an aſſurance of his love.* And laſtly, *Sinne is forgiven when the temporal affliction is removed*; and in this ſenſe the Scripture doth much uſe the word, *forgiveneſſe of ſins*, and his *not pardoning*, is when he will *puniſh.*

II. Sin may be ſaid to be forgiven divers wayes.
1. In Gods Decree.
2. In Chriſt meritoriouſly through faith.

3. Sin is pardoned when the guilt is taken away.
4. When God gives us aſſurance of his love.
5. When temporal affliction is removed.

3. *There are ſeveral things conſiderable in ſin, when we ſay it is forgiven.*

III. Several things conſiderable in ſinne, when it is ſaid to be forgiven.

Firſt, In ſinne there is *a privation of that innocency which he had before*; as when a man is proud, by that act of pride he is deprived of that innocency and freedom from that guilt which he had before. This is *properly* true of *Adam*, who loſt his innocency by ſinning: It cannot be affirmed of us, but in a *limited ſenſe*, thus far, that when a man commits a ſin, that guilt may be charged upon him, whereof he was innocent before. Now, when *ſinne is forgiven*, the ſenſe is, not that he is

1. A privation of innocency.

made innocent again, for that can never be helped, but that it must be affirm'd such an one hath sin'd, this cannot be repaired again. It is true, the Scripture useth such expressions, *That iniquity shall be sought for, and there shall be found none*, Jer. 51.20. But that is in *respect of the consequents of it*. We shall have as much joy and peace as if we had not sinned at all.

2. Desert of the wrath of God.

A second thing in sinne, is *the dignity and desert it hath of the wrath of God*, and this is inseparable from any sin: if it be a sin, there is a *desert of damnation*; and thus all the sins of the godly, howsoever they shall not *actually condemn* them, yet they have a *desert of condemnation*.

3. An actual ordination of the person sinning to everlasting condemnation.

Thirdly, *There is the actual ordination, and obligation of the person sinning to everlasting condemnation:* and *forgivenesse of sin* doth properly lie in this, not in taking away *the desert of the guilt of sin*, but *the actual ordination of it to condemnation*. Therefore its false that is affirmed by some, that *reatus est forma peccati*, Guilt is the form of a sin, for a sin may be truly a sin, and yet this *actual ordination of it to death*, taken away.

4. An offence done unto God

Fourthly, *There is in sin an offence done unto God, or an enmity to him*, so that now he is displeased, and this is taken away in some measure by forgivenesse; yet so, as his anger is not fully removed. If we speak exactly, God doth not *punish* his children, yet as a Father he is *angry* with them, and that makes him to *chastise* them, though the sin be forgiven.

5. A blot or pollution in sin

Fifthly, *In sin is likewise a blot or pollution, whereby the soul loseth its former beauty and excellency*; and this is not removed by *remission*, but by *sanctification* and *renovation*. Hence it is ordinarily said, That Justification hath a *relative being only*, but Renovation, an *absolute inherent change*.

6. An aversion from God.

And lastly, *In all sin there is an aversion from God*; *either Habitual, in Habitual sins*; *or Actual, in Actual*: And in this *aversion* from God, the soul abideth, till it be turned to him again; as a man that turneth his back on the Sunne continueth so, till he turn himself again: Now *Conversion*, and not *Justification*, doth rectifie this; so that by this you may see, what it is to have a *sinne forgiven*, not the *foulnesse* or the *disformity* of it to Gods Law removed, nor yet the dignity and desert of Gods wrath; no, nor all kinde of

anger

anger from God, but the *actuall ordination of it to condemnation.*

IV. There is great difference between original and actual ſinne.

4. *There is a great difference between original ſin and actuals:* For that of *original* is much more perplexed in the matter of remiſſion, then thoſe of *actuals*; when an *actual* ſinne is committed, the act is *tranſient*, that is, quickly paſſed away, there remaineth only the *guilt*, which ſticketh, till God by pardon doth remove it, and then when he hath forgiven it, there is all of that ſin paſt. But now in *original* ſin it is otherwiſe; for that *corruption* adhering to us, *cleaving to our Nature*, like Ivy to the Tree (as the Father expreſſeth it) though it be forgiven, yet it ſtill *continueth*, and that not only as an *exerciſe of our faith and prayers*, or by way of a *penal languor* upon us, but *truly* and *formally* a ſinne, ſo that its both a *ſinne*, and the *cauſe of ſinne*, and the *effect of ſinne* at the ſame time. Now in this particular lyeth the greateſt part of the difficulty in the Doctrine of *forgiveneſſe of ſinne*; for here ſinne is in the *godly*, and *truly ſo*, yet for all that it doth not *condemn*. The Papiſts finding by experience, ſuch *motions of original ſinne* in us, yet do ſay, they are only *penal effects*, and remain as *opportunities* by ſpiritual combate *to increaſe the Crown of Glory*: and this they urge, as impoſſible they ſhould be ſins, and yet not *condemn* the godly, becauſe *guilt* is inſeparable from ſinne. And the *Antinomian* doth expreſly ſtumble at this ſtone [D^r *Criſps Serm. vol. 2. pag. 92.*] *For my part* (ſaith he) *I do not think as ſome do, that* guilt *differs from* ſinne, *but that it is* ſinne it ſelf: They are but two words expreſſing the ſame thing. Now if it were ſo, that *ſinne* and *guilt*, or the *ordination of it to puniſhment* were the ſame thing, there could be no *ſinne* in the godly. It is true, *guilt* cannot be, but where *ſinne* hath been, yet *guilt of puniſhment* may be removed, when the *ſin* is paſt. But this the Author doth ſhew, that *ſin* was ſo laid on Chriſt, that from that time he ceaſeth to be a ſinner any more. Thou art not a Thief, a Murtherer, when as you have part in Chriſt, *pag.* 89. *ut ſupra.* But of this hereafter.

V. When ſin is forgiven it is totally & perfectly forgiven

5. *When a ſin is forgiven, it is totally and perfectly forgiven,* This is to be conſidered in the next place, for when the *Antinomian* would have us ſo diligently conſider that place *Jer.* 50. 20. where

where God saith, *The iniquities of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none.* If (I say) this were all his meaning, sin shall be as if it had never been in *respect of condemnation*, he shall be as surely *freed from hell*, as if he had never sinned; all this is true. But they have a further meaning, and that is, That the sin was so laid upon Christ, that the sinner ceaseth to be a sinner, as if because a Surety payeth the debt of some leud bankrupt, that very paiment would make him cease to be a bankrupt, that is false; yet God doth so *forgive sin*, that it can be *forgiven no more perfectly then it is*: Those sins cannot be forgiven any more then they are, which is matter of infinite comfort; and as it is *totally*, so *irrevocably*, God will not revive them again: Hence are those expressions of *blotting them out*, of *throwing them into the depth of the sea*; And howsoever that Parable, *Mat.* 18. which speaks of the *Master forgiving a servant so many talents*, yet upon the servants cruelty to some of his fellows, his Master calleth him to account, and throweth him in prison for his former debts; howsoever (I say) this be brought by some to prove that *sins forgiven*, may upon after iniquities be charged upon a man, yet the ground is not sufficient. For first, The main scope only of a Parable is *argumentative*. The Fathers do fitly represent Parables to many things; to a Knife whose edge doth only cut, yet the back helps to that; to a Plow whose Plough-shear only cuts, yet the wood is subservient: So in a Parable, The main scope and intent is onely *argumentative*; the other parts are but like so many shadows or flourishes in the picture to make it more glorious: Now this instance was not mainly intended by our Saviour, but forgiveneſſe of one another; so that this part doth only shew, what is in use amongst men, or what sin doth deserve at Gods hands; not that God *revoketh* his pardon, or *repenteth* that ever he hath forgiven us: But this is more expressly answered afterwards.

VI. Though sin be forgiven yet the sense of Gods displeasure may remain.

6. *Though sin be forgiven, yet there may be the sense of Gods displeasure still*; For as, though God doth forgive, there are many calamities and pressures upon the godly: So though Christ hath born the agonies that do belong unto sin, yet some scalding drops of them do fall upon the godly; not that the godly is by these *to satisfie the Justice of God*, but that hereby we might feel

feel the *bitternesse of sin*, what wormwood and gall is in it, that so we may take heed for the future, and that we may by some proportion think on, and admire the great love of Christ to us, in undergoing such wrath. Didst thou not judge the least of his anger falling upon thee more terrible, then all the pains and miseries that ever thou wast plunged into? And by this then thou maist stand amazed, and wondering at this infinite love of Christ to stand under this burden for thee. *David* is a pregnant instance for the truth of this. As when *Saul* was angry with *Jonathan*, and run a Javelin at him, he escaped, and that run into the wall; so the wrath of God, which was violently to fall upon thee, missed thee, and ran into Christ. But the sense of Gods displeasure for sinne, may be retained in us two wayes:

And that two wayes:

First, *Servilely* and *slavishly*, whereby we run from the promise and Christ, and have secret grudgings and repinings against God, this is sinfull for us to do. 1. Servilely.

Secondly, There is a *filial* apprehending of Gods displeasure, though we are perswaded of the pardon; this is good and necessary, as we see in *David*, who made that *Psalm of Repentance*, *Psal.* 51. though he had his absolution from his sin. Tears in the soul by the former way, are like the water of the Sea, salt and brackish; but those in the later are sweet, like the rain of the Clouds falling down on the earth. 2. Filially.

7. *No wicked man ever hath any sin forgiven him*; For seeing *remission of sins*, is either a *part* or *fruit* of Justification, no wicked man is more capable of the one then the other: Indeed we may reade concerning wicked men, *Ahab*, and the *Israelites*, when they have *humbled* themselves, though *externally* and *hypocritically*, yet God hath *removed those judgements*, which were *imminent* upon them, and thus farre their sins have been *forgiven them*; but God did not at the same time take off the *curse* and *condemnation* due to them. Though they were delivered from outward calamity, yet not from hell and wrath. *This* therefore doth demonstrate the wofull condition of wicked men, that have not one farthing of all their debts they owe to God paid, but are liable to account for the least sins, and it must needs be so, for Christ the true and onely VII. The wicked hath no sin forgiven.

paymaster of his peoples debts doth not own them; so that when their sins shall be sought for, every one in all the aggravations of it will be found out.

VIII. Remission of sin onely to the penitent

8. *This remission of sin is only to the repenting, believing sinner.* To the repentant, *Act.*5.31. *To give repentance to Israel, and forgivenes of sins.* So *Luk.*44.47. *That repentance and forgivenes of sins should be preached in his Name,* Act.8.22. *Repent and pray, if the thoughts of thy heart may be forgiven thee,* 1 Joh.1 9. *If we confess our sins he is faithfull to forgive,* &c. These, and many other places do abundantly prove, that there is not *forgivenes*, but where there is *repentance*. Therefore look upon all those doctrines, as false and dangerous, which make *Justification* to be before it. Not that we do with Papists make any *merit* or *causality* in *repentance,* or that we limit it to such a *measure* and *quantity* of repentance, nor as if we made it the *Condition of the Covenant of Grace*; but only the *way, without which* (not the *cause for which*) *remission of sins* is not obtained, neither can there be any instance given of men *forgiven*, without this *repentance*; and the same likewise is affirmed of *faith,* though faith is in another notion then repentance, this being the *instrument* to apply and receive it. But of this hereafter.

IX. Remission of sins not limited.

9. *This remission of sin is not limited to persons, times, or the quantity and quality of sins.* Indeed the sinne againſt the holy Ghost cannot be forgiven: we will not explain that (cannot) by difficulty, as if indeed it might be forgiven, but very hardly. The ordinary answer is, That therefore it cannot be forgiven, because the person so sinning, will not confesse, humble himself, and seek pardon. God is described by pardoning iniquity, transgressions and sins. Christ is said to take away the sinne of the world. *David* and *Peters* sins were voluntary, yet God forgave them.

Lect. IV.

Of the Afflictions that come upon the Godly after the Pardon of their Sinnes.

Rom. 3. 24, 25.

Being Justified freely by his Grace, &c.

THe Doctrine about *remission of sin* being thus particularly declared, we come to that great question, *How afflictions come upon the Godly after the pardon of their sinnes?* For the Antinomian goeth into one extremity, and the Papist into another, so true is that of *Tertullian*, *Christ is alwaies crucified between two theeves*, that is, Truth suffers between two extream errours. Therefore in prosecuting this point, which is of great practicall concernment, I will lay down, First, What the Antinomian saith. Secondly, What the Papist. And lastly, What the Orthodox. The Antinomian in his Book, called the *Honey Comb of Justification*, explaineth himself in these particulars, by which you may judge that his *Honey* is *Gall*. Having made this Objection to himself, that *the children of God are corrected by God, therefore he seeth sinne in them*, maketh a large Answer: Distinguishing first of *afflictions*, calling some *Legall*, and some *Evangelicall*, and then he distinguisheth of *persons*, making some *unconverted*, others *converted*; the *unconverted* again, he makes to be either such as are *reprobate*, or else *elected*; now (saith he) the *Legall crosses* have a two-fold operation, either *vindicative* or *corrective*: *Vindicative*,

How afflictions come on the godly after their sins are pardoned.

The Antinomians errour therein.

Chap. 7. pag. 121.

are such afflictions as God executeth upon the wicked and *reprobates*, in which sense God is called the God of vengeance: *corrective*, are such lashes of the *Law*, as are executed upon those persons that are the *children of God by election*, but not yet *converted*, and so under the Law, therefore these *afflictions* are not in *wrath*, to confound them, but in *mercy* to prepare them to their conversion, for God seeing sins in them, layeth crosses upon them. Now these *elect persons* he cals *unconverted*, *actively* and *declaratively*, in a very ambiguous and suspicious manner, as if *conversion* were *from all eternity*, as well as *Justification*, so that as they say, a man *in time* is justified only *declaratively*, being *indeed so from all eternity*, thus he must be said to be *converted*: and if this be true, then it will likewise follow, that a man in heaven is *glorified* likewise only *declaratively*, but *actually* and indeed *glorified from all eternity*, even while he is in this miserable house of clay. In the next place he comes to *Evangelicall* crosses, which fall upon them that are *actively* and *declaratively* (as he cals it) *converted*, and these he denieth expresly to be for their sinnes, for this were (saith he) to deny Christs *satisfactory punishment*, because by his death we have not one spot of sinne in us: therefore he makes them to be only the *triall* of their *faith*, and to exercise their faith: so that (by his divinity) when a Godly man is afflicted, the flesh would indeed perswade a man hath sinne in him, but this is to try whether thou canst beleeve thou art cleansed from sinne for all these afflictions. Therefore if a man yield to this temptation (*viz.* that he hath sinne in him when he is afflicted) what is this (saith he) but to deny Christ and his blood? Think you this to be the voice of the Scriptures? Hence he laboureth to shew that twelve absurdities would follow from this Doctrine of Gods afflicting his children for their sinnes, the strength of which shall be in his place considered; I have now only laid down his judgement; and he makes the Doctrine of the Protestants opposing this to be Popish, and confounding the Law and the Gospel together. Hence intending the Protestant Authors and Ministers, he saith, They paint God like an angry Father ever seeing sinne in us, and ever standing with a rod and staff in his hand, lifted up over our heads, with which by reason he seeth

sinnes

ſinnes in us, he is ever ready, though not to ſtrike us down, yet to crack our crowns, and ſorely to whip us: whereas the Goſpel deſcribeth him to be not only a loving Father, but alſo our well-pleaſed Father, at perfect peace with us; ſo that the upſhot of his poſition is to ſhew, that they are taskmaſters and do degenerate to the Legall teaching in the Old Teſtament, whoſoever preach that God doth correct Believers for their ſinnes: and I have, ſaith he, ſomewhat the more largely hunted this Fox, becauſe it is ſo nouriſhed, not only by the Papiſts, but alſo ſome of us Proteſtants, who by liſping the language of *Aſhdod*, do undermine the very roots of the Lords Vine. And that you may ſee it is not one mans judgement amongſt them, ſee what their great Generall ſaith in a Sermon, *pag.* 162. Know this, that at that inſtant, when God brings afflictions upon thee, he doth not remember any ſinne of thine, they are not in his thoughts towards thee. Again, Whatſoever things befall the children of God, are not puniſhments for ſinnes, they are not remembrances of ſinne, and if men or Angels ſhall endeavour to contradict this, let them be accounted as they deſerve. Thus the Antinomian. The Papiſt goeth into another extremity, for thus they hold, *Bellar. de pœni. lib. 4. cap.* 1. & 2^do^, That when God hath *forgiven a ſinne*, yet it is according to his Juſtice that the ſinner ſhould *ſuffer*, or *do ſomething to ſatisfie this juſtice*, not in reſpect of the *ſinne* as it is *againſt God*, (for although ſome ſay ſo, yet others reject it) but in reſpect of ſome *temporall puniſhment*, either in *this life*, or in the *life to come*, which is the ground of *purgatory*. And that this may be made good, they ſay, When God doth *forgive a ſinne*, he doth not preſently remit the *temporall puniſhment*; therefore men may by ſome *ſatisfactory penalties voluntarily taken* upon themſelves, reſcue themſelves from theſe *temporall puniſhments*. Now this is a doctrine extreamly derogating from the full ſatisfaction of Chriſts death, as the Orthodox ſhew againſt the Papiſts. Therefore in the third place, the truth is this, That *God when he forgiveth a ſinne* or ſinnes, *he doth likewiſe take off all temporall puniſhment*, properly ſo called, *viz. in order to* any *vindicative juſtice*, as if a further ſupply were to be made to Chriſts ſufferings by what we endure: yet we ſay withall, that God indeed doth *take notice* of *the ſinnes of*

Dr. *Criſpe.*

The Papiſts error concerning the ſame.

The Orthodox truth is, that God forgiving ſin, remits the puniſhment in order to Vindicative juſtice.

those that are justified, and doth *correct* them for them; so that when he chastiseth them, it is in reference to their *sinnes*, they are the occasion, or the *impulsive cause* (as we may say, though improperly when we speak of God.) Although the *finall cause*, and the end why God doth so, is not to *satisfie his justice*, but for other ends. It is doubted whether we may call them *punishments* or no? but we need not litigate about the word, I see *Chemnitius* and *Rivet* cals them so. And if we make a distinction in Gods end, why he afflicts the Godly for their sinnes, from that when he punisheth the wicked, though both for their sinnes, we speak the truth fully enough, though we call them *punishments*; and certainly the words *punish* or *punishment*, used *Hos.*4.19. *Ezek.*9.13. *Levit.*26.41. do not take the word *punishment* in such a *strict sense*. The Greek word κόλασις is used of the damned Angels and men, 2 *Pet.*2.9. *Matth.*25.46. and this word seems not applicable to the afflictions of Gods people for their sinnes, and so the word παιδεία seemeth to be an act of some *Judge*, who doth not *attend to mercy*, παιδῶ σοι, βοηθῶ σοι, παιδεύω δὲ ὡς ἀντὶ τῦ βασανίζω, *Suidas in voc.* But the word κρίνειν to *Judge*, is attributed to God when he doth *correct* his children, 1 *Cor.*11.31. where the Apostle useth three words in an elegant paronomasia, κρίνειν, διακρίνειν, and προκρίνεσθαι; so then when God doth afflict his people, he may be said to do it as a *Judge*, and *afflictions* are called *Judgements*, 1 *Pet.*4.17. only when God doth thus *correct* and punish *his people*, he is *paternus Judex*, a fatherly Judge. But the most expressive word of these *afflictions*, is παιδεύειν, which denoteth God afflicting his people, as a *Father* his child; and although he doth it, because of their faults, yet he hath tenderness in what he doth. This is the truth, and for the proving of it, consider these Propositions,

but yet corrects in mercy as a father.

Propositions proving the same.

1. God afflicts not any but where sin is.

First, That *God doth not afflict any but where there is sinne in the subject*; for so was the threatning at first, *in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die*. By *death* is meant all kinde of evil and *punishment*, so that had there been *no sinne* going before, there had *no curse*, either upon man or creatures followed after. Hence it is that Divines say, The very hunger and thirst which *Adam* had, while in the state of integrity, was without

out that pain and provocation as it is in us. So that the state of man in righteousnes, was like the heavens that admit of no corruptive alterations. As for that dispute, Whether God may not by his absolute Soveraignty adjudge man without the consideration of sinne to everlasting misery, the affirmative decision of it will not much incommodate this truth, seeing that even then (they say) God doth this *per modum simplicis cruciatus*, by way of a meer naked trouble and pain: not *per modum pœnæ*, by way of a punishment. As for Christ, he though *innocent*, was *a man of sorrows*, because our sinnes were laid on him.

Secondly, *That God may, and sometimes doth afflict, yet not in reference to sin.* Thus God doth *exercise Job*, who though he was not without sinne, yet God seemeth not to do it for sinne: Therefore such calamities were rather *exercises* of his graces, then *correctives* of his sinnes: they were to him, what a storm or a tempest is to a skilfull Pilate, what a valiant adversary is to a stout Champion; and to this purpose is that answer of our Saviour, when the question was, Whether the parents, or the blinde man himself had sinned, that he should be born blinde, (speaking according to the opinion of some Philosophers, that was now also received among the Jews, (as Learned men think) viz. *That there was a pre-existency of the souls before they were united to their bodies:*) our Saviour returneth this answer, *Neither hath this man sinned*, (because he had no being before his birth) *nor his parents*, (*viz.* some grievous sinne, for which God would punish the childe) *but cuely that the works of God may be made manifest.* This also must be granted. 2. God sometimes afflicts, yet not in reference to sin.

Thirdly, *That all afflictions and crosses are to be reduced to the Law.* We may acknowledge this Truth also, if so be by Law we mean strictly whatsoever doth command and threaten, and the Gospel to be only promissory, though if largely taken, the Gospel hath its curses and afflictions; so God threatning or afflicting of a godly man, doth so farre use the Law as an instrument to make him sensible of his sinne: and therefore this is a sure Argument, that the Law is not abolished as to all uses to the Believer, because still there do befall afflictions to the Godly, 3. All afflictions are to be reduced to the Law.

Godly, not only *from sinne*, (as the Antinomians speak) but *for sinne*; only as the Law without the grace of God worketh all evil, so do all afflictions likewise to men that are not godly: Therefore wicked men in afflictions are as garlick, or any ill-smelling herb, the more it is pounced, the worse smell it sends forth; so that there must be teaching, as well as chastening to make that affliction blessed.

4. There is a great difference in the calamities of the godly.

Fourthly, *That in the calamities which fall upon the godly there is a great difference*, some are *common* and *absolutely determined*, others *more special* and not *necessary*. This distinction must be attended, for God hath so peremptorily and irrevocably concluded upon some miseries as the fruits of sinne, that no repentance or humiliation can ever take them off. Thus though a man should have as much Faith as *Abraham*, as much meekness as *Moses*, as much uprightness as *David*, as much zeal and labour for the Church as *Paul*; yet all this would not free from death, nor could it remove the curse that is upon the ground; so a womans holiness and humiliation, cannot take away the pains and throbs in childe-bearing, for these are *absolutely decreed*. But then there are *speciall calamities*, which many times by turning unto God are taken away; yea and God very frequently when he pardoneth sinne, he taketh also away those outward miseries, as we see in many whom he healed both in soul and body at the same time. So that we say not God is bound alwaies when he doth pardon sin, outwardly to afflict for it.

5. Some calamities for sin, others for other ends.

Fifthly, *There are again some calamities that come upon them because of sinne, others for other ends.* We acknowledge it as clear as the sun, that many troubles upon the godly, are by way of *tryall* and temptation upon them, and because of the good that is in them; of these the Apostle *James* speaks, when he bids them *count it all joy, when they fall into divers temptations*; of these *Paul* speaks, when he saith he will *rejoyce in his infirmities*; so that the persecutions and miseries which come upon them are an Argument of the good in them, more then of the evils; as the tree that is full of fruit, hath its boughs more broken then that which is barren, and the Pyrates watch for the Ship that is fraughted with gold. And thus a Martyr comforted

comforted himself; *That though he had many sinnes, for which he deserved death, yet he thanked God that his enemies did not attend to them, but to the good that was in him, and for that he suffered:* so then all the grievances upon the godly are not of the same nature.

Sixtly, *The afflictions for sinnes upon the godly do differ much from those that are upon the wicked.* This we also grant, that when God doth punish the godly and the wicked for their sins, though the punishment for the *matter* of it may be alike, yet they differ in other respects very much, as in the *cause from which*, one cometh from a God hating their persons, the other from anger indeed, but the anger of a Father. Hence secondly, they differ in the *fittednes* of these afflictions *to do good*, God doth moderate these afflictions to his people, that thereby grace may be increased; but to the reprobate, they are no more to their good, then the flames of hell fire are to the damned: The Butcher he cuts the flesh farre otherwise then the Chirurgeon, saith *August.* Again, in the *end* they differ, All afflictions to the godly, are like the beating of cloathes in the Sun with a rod, to get out the dust and moths, but it is not so with the wicked: Many other differences practicall Divines prove out of the Scripture.

6. Afflictions for sins of the godly and wicked differ.

Seventhly, *Yet God doth in reference to the sinnes of his people, though forgiven, sometimes chastise them.* This is proved,

7. God sometimes chastises his people in reference to their sins though forgiven. This proved, 1. from Scripture.

1. From the *Scripture*, that makes their *sinne* the cause of their *trouble*: Thus of *David*, *Because thou* (saith *Nathan*, 2 *Sam.*12.14.) *hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the childe also that is born of thee shall die*: Thus God speaks to *all the godly* in *Solomon*, 2 Sam.7.14,15. *I will be his Father, and he shall be my sonne: if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, but my mercy will I not take away.* In these places *sinne* is expressly made the *cause* of those *afflictions*; and it is a poor evasion to say, this was in the Old Testament, for was not the chastisement of the godly mens peace, in the Old Testament, laid upon Christ, as well as in the New? but their folly herein, and their contradiction to themselves, will be abundantly shewed, in answering their Objections.

2. In the places that do assert Gods judging of the people.

2. *In the places that do assert Gods judging of his people, and rebuking of them:* and they are divers, 1 *Cor.*11. *For this cause many are sick and weak:* where again, you have not only the *affliction*, but the *cause why*, viz. *irreverent prophaning of that Sacrament.* Thus *James* 5.14. *Is any man sick? Let him call for the Elders, and let them pray for him, and if he have committed sinnes* (saith the Text) *they shall be forgiven him.* There is none but hath *committed sins*; yet the Apostle makes such an *if*, because he speaks of such sinnes that may provoke God to lay that sickness upon him. Thus in the Old Testament, *Psal.* 99.8. *Thou forgavest them, though thou tookest vengeance on their inventions:* Here the Psalmist cals the *chastisements* upon those whose *sinnes* were *forgiven, vengeance*; as in other places, his anger is said to *smoak against the sheep of his pasture*; but we must not understand it of *vengeance strictly so called*, as if God would satisfie his justice out of their sufferings.

3. From the incouragement to duties by temporall Arguments, and threats of temporall afflictions.

3. *From the incouragement to duties by temporall Arguments, and threats of temporall afflictions.* If the godly have these goads, then certainly as they may conclude their temporall mercies to be the fruit of their godlines, *which hath the promise of this life, and the life to come*; so they may conclude that their afflictions are the effects of their evil waies, which have the threatning of this life, and the life to come; only here is this difference, that the outward good mercies are not from their godlines by way of merit or causality, but their afflictions are so because of their sins: Hence the Apostle urgeth the godly, *Heb.*12.19. with this, that even *our God is a consuming fire:* Thus 1 *Pet.*3.10,11. *He that will love life and see good daies, let him eschew evil, and do good.* So that the Scripture pressing to holines because of outward good mercies, and to keep *from sin* because of externall evils, and pressing these to the godly, doth evidently declare this truth; and certainly the Apostle speaking of the godly, *Rom.*8.10. saith, *the body is dead because of sin*; for by *body*, *Beza* doth well understand *our mortall body*, and not the *mass of sinne*, as some interpret it.

4. From the comparison God useth concerning his afflictions upon his people.

4. *From the comparison God useth concerning his afflictions upon his people*; and that is, to be a *Father* in that act, *correcting* of them. Thus *Heb.*12. 6,7,8,9,10,11,12. compare this with

Rev.

*Rev.*3.19. *As many as I love, I rebuke*; now *rebuke* is alwaies for ſome *fault*: and this is further cleared, becauſe he makes this concluſion, *Be zealous therefore and repent*; therefore ſin was precedent. Now in theſe places God compareth himſelf to a *Father*, and believers to *children*; and we all know that *Fathers* never *correct* but *for ſinne*; it would be ridiculous, to ſay, the Father whips the childe *from ſinne*, not *for ſinne*. It is true, he doth it *from ſinne* by way of *prevention* to the future, yet *for ſinne* alſo. The Antinomian ſaith this is ſpoken of *many believers together, where ſome were not converted*; but this is weak, becauſe the perſons whom he reproveth, God is ſaid to *love* them, and they are *children* not *baſtards*. Again he ſaith, *There is no ſin mentioned*, therefore it was not *for ſin*; but I anſwer, the very compariſon of God with a Father, *correcting* his childe, doth evidently argue it was *for ſin*, though it be not expreſſed. *Hony Com.*133.

5. *From the command not to deſpiſe, or to make little account of Gods afflictions, but to humble our ſelves, and ſearch out our waies.* Why ſhould this be ſpoken, but becauſe they are *for our ſins?* Heb.12.5. *Deſpiſe not the chaſtening of God, neither faint when thou art rebuked of him.* Where two things may ſeem to be forbidden, though ſome make them all one; one not to *faint*, ἐκλύειν, a metaphor from thoſe who faint in the race, through languor and diſſolution of minde. The other is in the other extream, not ὀλιγωρεῖν *to deſpiſe*, or *to make little or nothing of it*: as it were a great fault in a childe, to ſlight or make nothing of his fathers corrections. Now let all the world judge whether the Antinomian Doctrine doth not open a wide gate to deſpiſe Gods afflictions: this makes them cry down Faſt daies, repentance, humiliation and confeſſion of ſin: yea, they make it Popery and hypocriſie what is done this way. Ποῖοι νῦν βρότοι εἰσιν we may ſay with *Homer*. 5. From the command not to deſpiſe our afflictions but to humble our ſelves.

6. If God hath commanded Magiſtrates to execute outward evils upon ſome godly men that have hainouſly offended, then its Gods will to afflict them for ſin; but he hath done ſo. If a godly man, being through the *Daliſah* of ſome corruption, perſwaded to have his hair cut off, his ſpiritnall ſtrength gone, and ſo he fall into the ſin of murder; Is it not Gods will that the 6. From the command given to Magiſtrates.

Magistrate should put him to death for this sinne? And what God would have the Magistrate do, is it not as much as if God himself had done? And must not all say, this is a chastisement upon him because of his sinne? Thus have I brought Reasons to prove that, which I think was never denied before till this age, which every day like *Africa* bringeth forth some Monster. And certainly the Doctrine of Afflictions upon the Godly is so sweet and wholsom a truth, that none but a Spider could suck out such poison from it, as the Antinomian hath done.

LECT. V.

Of Afflictions; Whether God chastiseth his Children for their sins.

ROM. 3. 24, 25.

Being Justified freely by his Grace, &c.

The Antinomian Paradox discussed.

WE come now to consider how the Antinomian can make good that Paradox of his, [*God chastiseth not believers because of their sins*] and indeed the Author forementioned doth much sweat and tug, in bringing in severall absurdities, which he conceives will follow upon the truth asserted by us. But before we examine them, let us take notice of the Authors great contradiction to himself in this point, and that within very few Pages; Falshood is not onely dissonant *from truth*, but also from *it self*; for whereas in the fore-quoted place he makes his Assertion *universal*, That *God seeth no sinne in persons converted*, and therefore there are *no afflictions befall them because of sinne*: Now see how flat contrary that same

same Author speaks in the same Book, *pag.* 117. for there making an opposition between the condition of *believers* in the *Old Testament*, and those in the *New*, he expressly gives this difference. *God* (saith he) *saw sinne in them, as they were children that had need of a rod, by reason of their non-age, but he seeth none in us, as being full grown heirs.* And again, *God saw sinne in them, and punished them for it, as they were under the Schoolmaster of the Law, but he seeth none in us.* Hence *Pag.* 99. he makes it peculiar to the time of the *Law*, that *Moses* for an unadvised word was strucken with death, and *Ozzah*, and *Jonah*, and *Eli*, with others, *temporally corrected.* Therefore (saith he) came those terrible Famines, whereby mothers were driven to eat their own children, all was because they were under the severity of the *Law*, that if they did but a little step awry, they were sharply scourged for the same.

Now how great a contradiction is this to his other Assertion? For were not the *godly* under the *Old Testament* actually *converted?* Had they not *Christs righteousnesse made theirs?* Were they not *elected?* How cometh it about then, that they were *afflicted for sin*, and not *believers* under the *New Testament?* When a man can bring the East and West together, then may he reconcile these Assertions: but self-contradiction is no strange thing in that Book.

But I come to his Arguments; The first place he urgeth, is *Rom.* 5. 1, 2, 3. *Being justified by Faith, we have peace with God,* that is, all beating, blows, and anger, are ceased (saith he;) and hence it is that *we glory in our afflictions:* but now if they were *for our sins*, we had no more cause to glory in them, then the childe hath in his whippings for his faults. Antinomian Arguments answered. *Argum.* 1.

For the opening of this place, consider these things: Some ancient Commentators reade the word imperatively (ἔχωμεν for ἔχομεν) *Let us have*, in stead of, *We have*, and thus they have interpreted it, [Being justified by Faith, let us take heed how we sinne again, but preserve our peace with God.]

The words taken this way would much confirm rather then debilitate our Assertion: But I do not judge this so suitable to *Answ.* 1.

the ſcope of the Apoſtle in this verſe; we will take them as they are, *indicatively*, or *aſſertively*: And firſt, we may mean by *Peace*, either that *reconciliation* which is made with God; or the *ſenſe* and *feeling* of this, which is nothing but *tranquillity*, and *ſecurity of conſcience*, through the perſwaſion of Gods *favour* to us. Now theſe may be ſeparable one from the other, a *believer* may be reconciled with God, and in the ſtate of friendſhip with him, yet he not *feel* this, or know this, as many paſſages in *Davids* Pſalms do witneſſe; even as the childe in the womb knoweth not the great Inheritance and rich Revenues it ſhall be poſſeſſed of, or as *Agar* did not ſee the Well of water by her, but thought ſhe muſt periſh, till God opened her eyes. There is a ſeal of the pardon of ſinne, when yet the Proclamation of it is not made in the conſcience. If we take *peace* in the *firſt reſpect*, it is an abſolute univerſal Propoſition, and true of *every juſtified perſon*; but in the *later ſenſe* it is true only of *ſome perſons*, and at *ſome times*, for the ſenſe of Gods favour is a ſeparable priviledge from thoſe that are in it.

If by *Peace* we ſhould underſtand the *ſenſe* of Gods favour, and the *declaration* of it in our conſciences (as by their Arguments they muſt do) then it proveth againſt their opinion, as well as any others: For they hold, That a believer needeth to pray for *pardon* in the *declaration*, or *ſenſe*, and *feeling of ſin*, though not for the *pardon it ſelf of ſin*; now there cannot be at the ſame time a *want* of the *feeling of pardon of ſinne*, and the *tranquillity of conſcience* together: So that this place muſt needs be a thorn in their ſide.

Anſw. 2. But ſecondly, the true and direct Anſwer to this place is, That there is a two-fold *Peace*, one which is oppoſite to the *hatred of God*, as he is a *terrible enemy* to ſinners unreconciled with them, in which ſenſe he is often deſcribed in Scripture. The other, as it is oppoſite to that *Fatherly anger* and diſpleaſure, whereby though for the main reconciled, yet he may for ſome particular faults be diſpleaſed: Now the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the former kinde of peace, *Being juſtified*, that is, God being once *reconciled* with us in Chriſt, he hath no more *hoſtile enmity* againſt us, and if we do ſinne afterwards, he will

will not become an *enemy* to us, or satisfie his Justice by punishing of us, but as a *Father* he may in his displeasure *chastise* us. The sense of Gods displeasure as a Father, may well stand together with an Assurance, that for all this he is no enemy. A childe that bitterly crieth out, because of his Fathers chastisements, yet even then hath that hope and comfort, which he would not have, if fallen into the hands or rage of an enemy that would kill him. Hence it is that we presse all believers, though sorely punished for their sins, as their hearts can tell them, yet they must never passe such a sentence, Now God is become my enemy, he deals with me as with a *Judas*, as with a *Cain*; these (we say) are sinfull inferences, but they may conclude thus, God though a loving Father is now very angry, and much displeased with me.

Distinguish then between a *peace* that doth oppose the *hatred of God* to a sinner as an *enemy*, and a *peace* which doth oppose onely the *frowns of a Father*; and this Objection is answered. I will acknowledge, the people of God are apt under his sore displeasure, not to discern between a *Father*, and an *enemy*. They have much ado to keep up this in their hearts; God he smites, he frowns, he chides, yet he is a *Father* still: but this is their temptation and weakness, and we are apt to endeavour some kind of compensation to God in our troubles for sin: Therefore it was a most blessed thing, when God at the Reformation out of Popery, caused this truth to break out, That *punishments for sin*, were not *Satisfactory to God, but fatherly chastisements*. Thus you have this answered, and as for that which followeth, *We glory in tribulations*, the Apostle must be limited to those which fall upon us *for professing of Christ and his truth*. In these we may glory, as the souldier doth of his marks and wounds he hath received in the wars for a good cause; and to this purpose, we told you in one Proposition, That there was a great difference between those troubles that fell upon us, because of the *good in us*; and those which come upon us, because of the *evil in us*. *What glory is it* (saith *Peter*, 1 Pet. 2. 20.) *if ye be buffeted for your faults?* Now who can deny but that even a Godly

a Godly man may fall into some hainous crime, for which he may receive a sentence of death: This man, though he may rejoyce in God, who doth pardon the sin to him, yet he can no more glory of this tribulation, then a childe doth of whipping for his faults.

Argum. 2. Another place of Scripture is, *Isa.* 53. 5. *The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.* This Text of Scripture is again and again pressed by them, and certainly it is more sweet then the *Honey or Honey-comb*: but truly they do with it, as the thieves with the man of *Jericho*, leave it half dead, and much wounded.

Answ. 1. First, Let us open the place, and then see how farre they are from the meaning. The Prophet *Isaiah* in this Chapter, may be called, as we said before, the fifth Evangelist, for he seemeth rather to write an History of Christ, then make a Prophecy of him. Among other passages these two are to our purpose.

1. That *the chastisement of our peace was upon him.* By *Peace* here, *Calvin* doth well understand, not that of *quietnesse* in the conscience, but a *Reconciliation* made with God through his sufferings. And it is observed by some, how emphatical the Scripture is in that Pronoun [*He*] *He hath born*, and *he hath been wounded.*

The second follows, *With his stripes we are healed.* Some think that this is spoken to debase that condition Christ so voluntarily put himself in, that so his love might appear the more to us; it being an allusion to the *state of servants*, who used to be *chastised* by their lords. The phrase is the same with that, *He hath born our griefs*, or diseases, which *Matth.* 8. 17. is applied to Christs *healing of diseases*, and 1 *Pet.* 2. to that *suffering upon the Cross.* And well may this be, because the *outward healing of diseases*, was a Symbole or Testimony of his *inward healing.* Although *Grotius* observeth, That Christ is therefore said to *bear our diseases* when he *cured* them, because of the great pains and travail he took therein, for it was after Sun-set, and the multitude did much throng him; so then, by the words, you see the whole price of our peace laid upon Christ, and by him all evils, both temporal and spiritual removed: But what is this to the pur-

pose?

pose? Yes, say they, here our *chastisements are laid upon Christ*, therefore *we have none for sin*. But first, If this prov'd any thing it will be more then the Antinomians will yield; for it would infer, that there are no *chastisements* at all, either *for sin*, or *no sin*. Now the Antinomians cannot deny (and experience confuteth them) but that the *godly* have *afflictions*, though (as they say) not *for sin*; and this will inevitably follow by their Argument; for as they would prove from hence, they have *no sin* at all, not only sin that will not *condemn* (as the Orthodox say) but even *no sin*; so it will by the same reason follow, that *believers* have no *chastisements* at all. I do not say (not for sin) but none at all.

But secondly, The Antinomian in that place, (*pag.* 129.) doth fully answer himself, *All chastisement* (saith he) *for sin, needfull for the making perfect peace between God and his justified children, was laid upon him*; very true, Therefore (say we) though these *chastisements* be *for sin*, yet they are not upon the godly as upon Christ, they are not to *satisfie Gods Justice*, to work a *reconciliation*, but onely to humble them in themselves, and make them the better feel how much they are beholding to Christ, who bore so much wrath for them. To say therefore as the Papists, Christ by *his death* did only remove the *spiritual evil*, and we *by our sufferings* must take away the *temporal punishment*, this would indeed be derogatory to Christ, and take off in a great measure from his glory. *Answ.* 2.

A third place brought in to maintain their errour, is *James* 1. 2, 3, 4, 5. *Count it matter of all joy, when you shall fall into divers temptations*; Therefore (saith he) they are not *for sinne*, because they are matters of joy; and mark how he baptizeth (goeth on the Author) *crosses* and *afflictions*, as it were with a new name, taken from the nature of the change of them through the Gospel, calling them *temptations* and *trials*. But mark the ignorance of the Adversary, rather then the name of afflictions: For is it peculiar to believers under the Gospel, that their afflictions are *trials*; what then will he return to that place, *Deut.* 8. 2. God saith, the *afflictions* upon the people of *Israel* for fourty years in the wilderness, (and they were not all believers, much *Argum.* 3.

leſſe believers under the Goſpel) were to *humble* them, and *prove* or *try* them? And *Jer.*9.7. God ſpeaking of the *Iſraelites* ſaith, *He will melt them and try them.* See alſo *Dan.*9.25. *Zech.* 13.9. Whereby you will preſently judge of the mans bold ignorance. But as for the place it ſelf, certainly the words are very emphatical. *Count it* (implying a man in his choiſeſt deliberation ought to do ſo) *all joy*, an Hebraiſm, *full perfect joy, when ye fall*, the word is *ſo fall*, that ye are compaſſed round about. And laſtly, *divers temptations*; By temptations, *Auſtin* ſeemeth to have underſtood Incitements or provocations to ſin, and whether ſuch temptations may be deſired, or do give ground of a juſt joy, is diſputed by the Schoolmen, but that is impertinent: we ſee the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of *afflictions*, as appeareth by the word following, and not all kinde of afflictions, but ſuch as are for *Chriſts name:* certainly the Apoſtle writing to the *Corinthians*, and ſpeaking of the *chaſtiſements* of God upon them for their *ſins*, he doth not bid them *count that all joy*, but rather exhorts them *to judge themſelves that they be not condemned with the world.* He doth not then ſpeak of *all kinde of afflictions*, but *ſome* only; and his meaning is not, that under even thoſe *afflictions*, they ſhould have no grief (for he ſaith, *No affliction is for the preſent joyous, but grievous*) but he giveth one reſpect, why they ſhould rejoyce, becauſe of the good work of their faith manifeſted thereby, though in other conſiderations they may be humbled. And I ſee not but even in thoſe *perſecutions* which befall the *godly* for the *Goſpels ſake*, they may not, ſome of them at leaſt, and ſometimes, be *humiliations* for the godlies former ſins, as well as *explorations* of their *graces*, and more eminent glorifying of them here and hereafter. I deny not but even in *afflictions for their ſins*, the people of God may take comfort to their ſouls from ſeveral conſiderations, but I think not that the Apoſtle doth refer to them in this place. Let us now conſider what dangerous Abſurdities would flow from this Doctrine of ours. And

Abſurdities objected by Antinomians.

1. Abſurdity objected.

Firſt (ſaith he) *This is to confound Law and Goſpel together. The Law ſhould be preached only to ſecure ſinners, the Goſpel to broken ſinners only; whereas if you tell the godly, when they are afflicted, that it is from their ſins, you preach Law to them.*

But

But first, Then the Apostle mingled Law and Gospel, when he commands the *Corinthians to judge themselves under Gods hand upon them.* And how legal was *Peter*, when he said, *Judgement must begin at the house of God?* *Answ.* 1.

2. The Gospel and the Law are to be mingled in all spiritual administrations, but for different ends. As they must not in preaching be confounded, so neither divided. *Answ.* 2.

3. The people of God have still sin, pride, and hardnesse of heart remaining in them, and shall a Minister preach the Gospel to his pride? Shall we comfort them, because their hearts are sometimes dull and froward? *Answ.* 3.

Lastly, Though we say, they are *afflicted for their sins*, yet this is not to make the crosses *Legal*, but *Evangelical*; but we do not say, they are so *for their sins*, as that thereby they must *satisfie the Justice of God* in their *own persons*, but for other considerations. *Answ.* 4.

A second Absurdity will be, say they, *hereby to make the Gospel unsufficient to abolish the old man, unlesse it borrow help from the Law.* 2. Absurdity objected.

But first, Observe his contradiction, The Gospel doth abolish sin in the believer; How can that be, when he holdeth, there is no sin to be abolished? Certainly that which is not needs not to be abolished, for it is not already. *Answ.* 1.

2. If the Gospel be so powerfull to abolish sinne, why will he have the Law preached to obstinate sinners? Certainly by his rule the Gospel would sooner melt the tougheſt and most stonny sinner that is. 2.

3. That which he would have such an absurdity, is an eminent truth: The Law and the Gospel are mutually subservient to each other, and are to be preached as conjoyned, though not confounded one with another. 3.

Another Absurdity (for I cannot take them in order, seeing he doth absurdly make one thing several Arguments, and so doth but tautologize) *This would be to deny Christs perfect righteousnesse, and that we are not made without all spots or blemishes.* 3. Absurdity objected.

But first, It doth not derogate from Christ, that we are not freed from sin, while here in this life, for he himself holdeth, the *Answ.* 1.

believers in the *Old Teſtament* had *ſin in them*, and God ſcourged them for it, yet Chriſt *bore* their ſins, and *took away* their iniquities.

2. 2. If this place prove any thing, it would the Popiſh Tenet, That we are inherently without ſinne: And the Antinomian denieth that; for he ſaith, *We are made perfectly holy*; not *actively*, but *paſſively*, whereas thoſe places ſpeak of an *active holineſſe*.

3. 3. If ſo be the ſin remaining in us, did not only bring *temporal* evils, but *eternal*; did not bring only a *diſeaſe*, but *hell* alſo; then this would evacuate the *fulneſſe of Chriſts death*, but now it doth not.

4. Abſurdity objected. A fourth Abſurdity he would fetch from an Argument of Biſhop *Babingtons*, *Ejus quod non eſt, non eſt pœna*, but *ſin* when it is *forgiven, is not*; Therefore to *forgiven ſin* there is no *temporal puniſhment*.

Anſw. I anſwer, firſt, If by that which *is not*, ſhould be meant, that which hath a *phyſical* and *natural exiſtence*, then the Argument would prove, that *no ſinne*, whether *forgiven*, or *not forgiven*, could damn a man, becauſe no *ſinne* (according to the received opinion) hath any *poſitive* natural *being*: Therefore it muſt be underſtood of a *moral being*, that is, a deſert of puniſhment. Now when ſinne is ſaid to be *forgiven*, the reaſon is not, as if *Remiſſion* of ſinne made *ſinne no ſinne*, drunkenneſſe no drunkenneſſe; or as if that *ſin* did not *deſerve puniſhment*, for that is inſeparable from the nature of it: but *forgiveneſſe* of ſins takes away the *actual ordination of them to condemnation*. So then, a *ſinne, though forgiven*, hath ſome kinde of *being*, though not that of *actual ordination* to *everlaſting death*; when therefore ſins are ſaid to be *thrown into the bottom of the ſea*, and *they ſhall be no more*, that is to be underſtood *quoad hoc*, in reſpect of *actual condemnation*. So *Davids* ſinne was forgiven, *viz.* as to *damn David*, yet though forgiven, it *was* ſtill, *viz.* to *afflict David*, and to make God angry with him.

5. Abſurdity objected. A fifth Abſurdity, *If you ſay the people of God are afflicted for ſinne, this would trouble the conſcience of Gods children exceedingly, and make them fearfully to expect horrible, temporal plagues,*

plagues every hour, because the least sinne is so infinitely distastfull to God.

But first, It seemeth then a Godly man though fallen into murder, adulteries, *&c.* his conscience must not be troubled: *Peter* if he denieth Christ, must not weep bitterly. *Answ.* 1.

2. We give many Cordials and Antidotes against despair, while we say they are *afflictions* even *for sinne*, for we adde further, that they are all *bounded within a due measure; God considers our strength, and will lay no more then he will enable to bear.* 2.

3. There is a two-fold trouble, one that is *holy* and *effectual for good*, such a trouble as that was which the Angel made in the pool of *Bethesda*; and there is a trouble *by way of torment, driving from, and raging at God*; now we all forbid this later, neither will this Doctrine give any ground to such a distemper. 3.

Lastly, If a Doctrine shall be branded for such an event as shall come through the corruptions of men, then we may say, their opinion will encourage believers, or men that do presume they are so, to act all manner of flagitious crimes, and yet to have no fear that God will plague them for those things. 4.

Lect. VI.

Of the Perfection of Justified persons, and their freedom from sinne; Whether God see sinne in Believers? Divers Scripture expressions about Pardon of sinne.

Jerem. 50. 20.

In those daies, and at that time the iniquity of Judah shall be sought for, and it shall not be found, &c.

Although the Apostle say true, 1 *Tim.*6.4. that there is a *doting about questions*, whereby the soul of a man is made sick and spiritually diseased, as the Greek word νοσῶν implieth, weakning and debilitating grace, as much as fretting doth waste away the flesh; and this is done when men incounter in controversies, as beasts in their combats, seeking only victory; yet there may be such a Doctrinall clearing of truth by answering of Objections that may tend much to edification, both in knowledge and affections; and by the striking of these flint stones together, there may fly out sparks enough to kindle godliness and zeal in our breast. This I shall endeavour by Gods assistance in that necessary and famous Question, of *Gods forgiving sinne.* For to preach in crabbed Controversies, is like *Gideon*, Judg.8.16. to teach men with briars and thorns, as the phrase there is. The Antinomian placeth this Text in the fore-

front

front, for that absurd opinion, *God seeth no sinne in persons justified*; if therefore their *Goliah* be slain, the rest will speedily quit the field. The words contain a gracious promise to *Judah* and *Israel*. The Text opened.

First, To deliver them from their *temporall evil*: They shall be brought out of their *captivity* into their own Country again: we need not dispute how many came back again, its enough this mercy was offered them, howsoever they might neglect it.

Secondly, Here is a promise to remove their *spirituall evil*, which was the cause of the former; God will pardon their sinnes: and by this a profitable Doctrine is taught, that *A people ought to be more desirous of Gods pardon, then of removall of their calamities*; whereas commonly like unwise diseased men, we complain more of the Symptoms then of the disease it self. The evil of sinne depriveth us of an infinite good; but the evil of afflictions, only of a finite. Now this promise is not to be stretched out only to the times of the Gospel, but is particularly true of the Jews, when removed out of their Banishment, yet not to be limited to that time only; and howsoever the *promise for pardon* be *general* to all, yet it is to be understood in this manner, that to the *wicked*, their sin was no farther *forgiven*, then in this sense, that their *captivity was removed*, but to the *true believers* there was a *real taking away of Gods wrath and displeasure from them*. The *promise of pardon* is described very emphatically and comfortably to the *truly humbled Jews*, *There shall be none of their sins*, and *none shall be found when sought for*: This expression doth suppose a *judiciall inquiry*, (as when God is said *to make inquisition for blood*) and *to be found*, doth imply, God *judicially taking notice of a man to punish him*; so *Rev.* 20. 15. *In her was found the blood of the Saints*: So *Beza* amplifieth that word, *Phil.* 3. 9. *be found in him*, as if the justice of God were pursuing *Paul* as a malefactor, and Christ was a City of refuge unto him.

Observ. *Remission of sin is such a taking of it away, as if it had never been*: he that denieth sins forgiven to be quite removed, denieth *Pharaoh* and his hoast to be drowned in the red sea, saith *Gregory*. Observation.

This

This Point practically improved is the treaſure of a believer comfort: But there is the Antinomian error on the right hand, and the Popiſh on the left, whereby a godly heart, if not well inſtructed, may when it cals for bread, meet with a ſtone, and when for fiſh, with a ſerpent. Therefore for the more orderly proceeding, let us conſider what the Antinomian ſaith; then what the Papiſt; and laſtly, what the truth is. The Antinomians opinion may be diſcovered in theſe particulars.

Errors concerning remiſſion of ſin. Antinomian errors.

1. 1. *That a juſtified perſon having on Chriſts wedding garment, hath thereby all his ſinnes quite taken away from before God, and ſo utterly aboliſhed, that we have not any ſpot of ſinne in the ſight of God,* (Honey Comb of Juſtification, *pag.* 24. *Cap.*3. *per totum.*)

2. 2. *This is extended by them* (pag.27.) *not only to actuall ſins, but originall ſins,* for we eaſily grant that *in actuall ſins, if once forgiven, there remaineth no more defilement, but that he is made in that reſpect of remiſſion, as white as ſnow, though there may remain a further diſpoſition to evil, by that ſinne once committed, if renewing Grace help not.*

3. 3. *This abolition of ſin, they underſtand both of the fault and the guilt; ſo that God doth not only take away the puniſhment, but both the form of the ſin alſo is wholly removed, ſo that there is neither puniſhment, nor cauſe of puniſhment, in one thus juſtified.* Hence they ſay, there is no ſin in the Church now, and they expreſs it thus, As a Phyſician, though he healeth a man, yet he cannot take away the ſcars; but God healeth ſin ſo, as no ſcarre remaineth, yea he giveth a freſh colour again. They ſay likewiſe, *our ſin is conſumed,* as if *one drop of water* ſhould be aboliſhed by the heat of the ſun, yea *pag.*39. the Authour affirmeth, that whoſoever have not confidence in this one point, *that our ſins are ſo taken away* by Chriſt, that God doth not *ſee* our ſins in us, without doubt are damned as long as they continue to rob the blood of Chriſt of this honour: Therefore (ſaith he) true Divinity teacheth that there is no ſinne in the Church any more.

4. 4. He diſtinguiſheth (*pag.*51.) of a two-fold *aboliſhing*, the one *myſticall and ſecret, wrought only by Chriſt and his righteouſneſs:* The other *groſs and palpable, wrought by us, by the help of Gods*

Gods Spirit, to our ſenſe and *feeling*; ſo that they grant *ſin in us*, and *ſin* to be *mortified, but this is not in Gods ſight*, although it be *in our own.*

5. Whereas it might be, and is objected, *God hath an all-ſeeing eye, and therefore he cannot but ſee ſinne if it be in us.* They anſwer, *God indeed ſeeth all things, ſaving that which he will not ſee, but undertakes to aboliſh out of his ſight*, and they diſtinguiſh of Gods *knowing* and his *ſeeing*, (pag.68.) God *knoweth believers ſinnes*, but he *doth not ſee them.* To *know*, is *to underſtand the nature of a thing*: but to *ſee* (according to them) is *to behold the reall exiſtence of a thing*: now that cannot be of *ſinne*, becauſe its *taken away.* Thus (ſay they) God did *know* the ſinnes of *Abraham*, and men did reprove him, but God did never once *rebuke* him in all his life *after his calling, for any one ſinne.* 5.

So that by theſe poſitions you may ſee their meaning to be, *that a juſtified man is by Chriſt ſo cleanſed*, that *God ſeeth nothing but what is perfectly holy in him*: ſin not only in the puniſhment, but in the exiſtence of it is removed quite away as to Gods ſight. Hence God takes no notice, never chaſtiſeth them, never reproveth them, becauſe he *ſeeth* nothing but what is *exceeding good*; and therefore becauſe the Juſtified feel the contrary, that they have ſin, they commend and preſs faith, to live above ſenſe, reaſon, and all our experience; for (they ſay) as a man that looks thorow red glaſs, ſeeth every thing red; ſo God looking thorow Chriſt, ſeeth not only our perſons, but all our actions, perfectly righteous with Chriſts righteouſneſs. What elſe may be ſaid of their opinion, is to be ſpoken of, when we treat of imputed righteouſneſs.

In the next place, let us conſider what is Popery in this point. The Papiſts, as *Bellarmine, lib. de Juſtific. Cap.7.* ſay with the Antinomian, *that forgiveneſs of ſin is the quite aboliſhing of it*, and that whether it be *originall* or *actuall*, ſo that no ſin abideth any more in a man ſo juſtified, till he fals from it; and, ſaith *Bellarmine*, If the Scripture would have invented words on purpoſe, to ſhew that ſin is quite extinguiſhed, it could not uſe other then it doth; and they think it impoſſible to conceive that there ſhould be *ſin* in a man, and yet *juſtified*; for this is (ſay they) Popiſh errors concerning Remiſſion of ſin.

they) to make him at the same time a childe of God, and the devil. The devil to dwell in him by *sin*, and Christ by *Justification*. Thus they distinguish not between *sin reigning*, and *sin being*. Though sin be in a godly man, yet it neither hath *vim damnatricem*, or *Dominatricem*, condemning power, or reigning power. Now its wonder the Papists should conceive this so impossible, when they hold that the godly have veniall sins, which yet are truly sins, and so by their own argument God must hate and punish them, yet God doth not break off his friendship for all that: now compare these two errors together in their agreement and difference.

Papists and Antinomians agreement,

1. Both Papist and Antinomian agree in this, *that remission of sin is quite abolishing* and extinguishing *of sin, both in the existence of it, and punishment*, (although some Papists hold for the later, *viz.* of *punishment*, at least *temporall*, that that may abide, though the sin be forgiven.)

1.

2. They both agree in the places of Scripture, as *Christ cleansing us from all sin, Thou art all fair my love, To purchase to himself a Church without spot or wrinkle*; these and the like, they both insist much upon.

2.

3. They both agree in reason to prove it, viz. *That sin is so odious to God that he hateth it wheresoever it is, and therefore a godly man must at the same time be the object of Gods hatred and love*, which (say they) is absurd to affirm; but here they differ; the Antinomian makes a *believer without sin, because of Christs righteousness which he is cloathed with*: The Papist he makes him to be without sin *inherently, because of the Grace of sanctification perfectly renewing him*. And indeed though the Antinomian seem to shew *more zeal* to Christ and grace, yet the Papist speaks *more to reason*; and if those places of Scripture did prove an utter extinguishing of sin, it would carry it fairer, for an *inherent perfect holiness* then such a *mysticall perfection* as they imagine. In the third place, I shall lay down the Truth, and wherein Scripture doctrine doth indeed sail between these two rocks.

3.

as also difference.

The Orthodox truth concerning remission of sin.

1. And 1. The Orthodox do distinguish of the *nature of sin*, especially *originall*, and the *guilt of it*, now (say they) the Scripture makes *forgiveness to be the removing of the guilt, but the nature doth still abide in some degrees*.

1.

2. This

2. *This sin even in the Godly, is seen by God, taken notice of, he hates it, and doth punish it, only he doth not punish it in their own persons, but in Christ*; so that the sinne of a godly man doth offend God, and he abhorreth, and will punish it, but Christ intervening, it fals upon him; so that our being in Christ, doth not hinder Gods taking notice of our sins, and hating of them, but only freeth us from finall destruction by them. 2.

3. If by *seeing of sin*, should be meant *judiciall* and *finall punishing of a man*, then we would say, *God doth not see sin in the godly* in that sense, and this some Orthodox have spoken, which the Antinomian mistaking, have lost the truth. Thus *Parem*, lib. 2. *de Justific. cap.* 9. p. 491. maintaining *that the godly mans sins are covered*, which (saith he) supposeth not that sins *are not*, but that they *are not seen*, maketh this objection, *but nothing is covered* or hid to God; and then answereth, True, *but what he would have covered*, but he will not fasten his eyes upon believers sins, because through Christ he turneth away the eyes of his justice, that he may place the eyes of his mercy upon them; and to this purpose he quoteth *Austin, Tecta peccata, quare dixit, ut non viderentur, quid enim erat Dei videre peccata, nisi punire? Brockman* likewise *de Justific. cap.* 2^do *qu.* 10. *pag.* 526. In vain is it objected, that *nothing is covered to God*, for that is true with this restriction, unless it be *that which he would have covered*, so that if by *seeing* were meant Gods *judiciall punishing* and condemning, in that sense *God doth not see the sins of believers*, for *he throweth them behinde his back*; but if by seeing be meant (as the Antinomian doth) Gods *not taking notice of, nor being offended with the sins of the godly*, so that he doth not *chastise* them for them; this is a very dangerous error, and is farre more then a difference about words; for the truth is, that the *sins of a godly man* do *offend* God, and he is *angry*, not as a *Father*, but as a *Judge*: Hence (as you heard) the *afflictions upon the godly are for their sins*, and called *judgements*; only he is a *fatherly Judge*. There is an excellent temperament of both these in God *relatively* to his people. For the further discussion of this main point, let us consider *practically*, the sweet and full expression of the Scriptures about pardoning of sin. 3.

Expreſſions in Scripture about pardoning of ſin. 1. Verball.

One word frequently uſed is *Naſa*, which ſignifieth to *lift up*, and *take away a thing* ſo, as that it was an *heavy burden*, and ſo ſome tranſlate that *Pſal.* 32.1. *Bleſſed is he who is eaſed of his ſin*, for you may ſee in that Pſalm, *David feeling an unſupportable weight upon him by his iniquities*, ſuch as he could not *ſtand under*; now to *pardon*, is to *take this weight off*; ſo *Gen.* 4.13. *My ſin is greater then can be born* or *taken away*, i.e. *forgiven*: again, *If thou doeſt well, is there not Levatio*, that is, *pardon* and *eaſe*? It is then no marvell if *forgiveneſs of ſin* be accounted ſuch a *bleſſed thing*, by thoſe who truly feel the *burden* of their iniquities. Hence you have it excellently, *Zech.* 3.9,10. made the *cauſe of all quietneſs* and content, when their *ſins were pardoned*, then they called to their neighbours *to ſit under their fig-trees*. And well doth *Calvin* call this *the chief hinge of Religion*, and the truth of this Doctrine is to be ſought out with all care, for what quietneſs can a man have till he know what judgement or eſteem the Lord hath of him, and in what manner it is wrought?

Another expreſſion of it is called *covering of ſin*; there are two words for this, the one is *Chaſah*, and is uſed properly of *ſuch a thing that is put between the object and the eye*. Num. 9.15. it is uſed of the *cloud that covered the Tabernacle*: its applied to a *garment*, or any other thing that doth *cover*. *Gen.* 3.*v.*21. its applied to God *covering Adams nakedneſs*; Hence a Learned man thinks *thoſe skins were of beaſts ſacrificed*, which did *prefigure* Chriſt; and God by this *covering* would as by an outward Symbole teach them *by whom their ſins ſhould be covered*, and to this an alluſion ſeemeth to be, *Rev.* 3.18. *I counſell thee to buy of me white garments, that thy nakedneſs may not appear*. A like word is *Caphar*, which ſignifieth *covering with pitch*, or the like, which doth ſo cleave to the thing it covereth, that it can hardly be removed. Its applied *Exod.* 15.27. to the *propitiatory* or *covering made of pure gold*, wherein God ſhewed himſelf gracious. It is uſed, *Levit.* 16.30. The word alſo is uſed of the *pitching of the Ark*, and as that pitch kept the waters from coming in, ſo doth the blood of Chriſt our ſins from overflowing us; and this doth excellently deſcribe the *nature of pardoning of ſin*, God doth as it were *hide it from us*, he will not *puniſh* it: but you muſt

not

not ſtretch this word too far with the Antinomian, as if indeed God did not *take notice* of them, for *Davids* when it was *covered* yet was *viſited afterwards* by God, but its *covered* ſo farre, as that it ſhall not *condemn*. We do not therefore as the Antinomian ſaith, make God peep under the covering again; but we ſay the word is a Metaphor, and muſt not be underſtood groſly and palpably, as if there were any reall thing put before the eyes of God, that he could not behold our ſins, but only that God will not *finally condemn us for ſin*. Furthermore, when a ſin *is pardoned*, it is ſaid to be *hid from Gods eyes, as if God did not know it*, Jer.16.17. the Hebrew word *Zaphan*, is applied to the *Northern part of the world*, becauſe it is *hidden from the heat of the ſun*. Hence *Joſeph* is called, *Gen.*41.45. *Zapthnath paaneah*, becauſe he was *a revealer of hidden things*. Thoſe iniquities therefore which are ſo often before thee, they are as it were *hidden* from God.

Another is *Mechah* (and I will name no more) which is to *blot out*, or *wipe out*, a Metaphor from thoſe who *cancell* or *blot out* their *debts* when once diſcharged.

Now beſides theſe verball expreſſions, you have many reall phraſes that do declare this great mercy, as *Micah* 7.19. he will *ſubdue our iniquities*, and *thou wilt caſt them into the bottom of the ſea*, where the Prophet doth admire the goodneſs and freeneſs of God herein, *Who is a God like thee, paſſing by iniquity, ſubduing ſins!* The word implieth, that our ſins were as our *enemies*, the *guilt* of them did *inſlave us*, and keep us like vaſſals in fear, but now they are *maſtered*. And further he *throweth them in the bottom of the ſea*, there is no more *memory* or *footſteps* of them; as when the Egyptians were drowned in the bottom of the ſea they could never hurt the Iſraelites more. Thus God doth to thy ſins when they are pardoned. Another expreſſion you have, *Iſa.*44.22. ſome expound it thus, *As the ſun riſing doth make the thick clouds to vaniſh away, and there is nothing but ſerenity to be ſeen*; ſo it is with God *pardoning*: but *Junius* underſtands it thus, *As the thick cloud diſſolved into rain, waſheth away the ſoil and filth of the earth*, ſo will the Lord in *pardoning take away* that *noiſomneſs and offence their ſins made*. Conſider *Hezekiahs* expreſſion, *Iſa.*38.17. *Thou haſt caſt all my ſins be-*

1. Reall expreſſions.

hinde thy back; It is an expreſſion from men, who when they will not regard a thing, caſt it behinde their backs, and thus God doth, not as if he did not *take notice* to *chaſtiſe* for them, but they ſhall not have their *proper effect*, which is to *condemn*. And theſe expreſſions are very neceſſary to a contrite heart, which is apt to imagine God as alwaies beholding his ſins, and ſending forth his judgements becauſe of them, whereas it muſt be as a foundation laid, That God is gracious and mercifull, not not only in the generall, but even to us in particular. The laſt I will pitch upon is *Pſal.* 13.12. *As farre as the Eaſt is from the Weſt, ſo farre hath he removed our ſins from us*; where the Pſalmiſt makes Gods mercies as much above our ſins, as heaven is above earth; and leſt the guilt of ſin ſhould hinder the deſcent of it, he makes God to *to throw away our ſins from him, as far as it can be*. Thus you ſee how abundant the Scripture is, in deſcribing this mercy of mercies: This mercy, which if not enjoyed, every thing, our beds, our fields and houſes will be an hell to us. The ſum of theſe words and phraſes amounteth to theſe comfortable Conſiderations.

Comfortable conſiderations ariſing from the fore-going phraſes.

1. Firſt, *That God pardoneth ſin, and removeth the guilt of it totally and perfectly*, ſo that a ſin cannot be more forgiven then it is: not that *all* the *pollution of ſin* is likewiſe *totally taken away*, for that would contrdict other places of Scripture, which ſay, *ſin is ſtill in us*, but only the *condemning power is ſubdued*; and therefore this Doctrine doth afford as much comfort as any Antinomian would deſire, and yet doth not fall foul with other places of Scripture. Thoſe ſins committed by thee and repented of, are as abſolutely forgiven as can be deſired: they can be no better pardoned if thou waſt in heaven, or hadſt perfect righteouſneſs beſtowed upon thee. It hath pleaſed God that the *guilt* of thy ſin ſhould be *perfectly remitted*, though the *power* be not *fully mortified*.

2. Secondly, Theſe phraſes imply, *That its Gods meer act without us, which doth expell the guilt of ſin, not any thing done in us, or by us*; and therefore thou art not to build thy hope of pardon upon any work of Regeneration or Mortification within thee, but Gods goodneſs without thee; even as a Creditor doth forgive many thouſands to a Debtor, by his meer voluntary act.

Now

Now we are apt to think, according to the principles of Popery, that our *Justification* is no better then our *inherent* holiness is, whereas any godly man may sit down and consider that he is not able to go out with his five thousand, against the Justice of God that comes against him with ten thousand. *Grace justifying* takes away all *guilt* of sin; *Grace sanctifying* doth not, because as *Bonaventure* well observeth, the remedy given by *grace* against *originall sin*, is not ordained against it, *prout corrumpit naturam, sed prout personam*, as it doth *infect our nature*, for so it sticketh till death; but as it doth *defile the person*; measure not therefore the *perfection* of *grace justifying*, by the *perfection* of *grace sanctifying*.

Thirdly, This Scripture language doth infer, *That sin forgiven is as if it had never been*; now the troubled soul crieth out, Oh that I had never been thus, done thus! Why, God when he doth pardon, makes it as if it had never been: do not fear the drowned Egyptians will rise up and pursue thee again. We may tell a *David*, a *Paul*, it is so with them as if no adultery, murder, or persecutions had been committed by them. 3.

Fourthly, *As God doth indeed really thus remit, so the Scripture commands the repentant sinner to believe this, and with confidence to rest satisfied.* Oh what holy boldness may this truth believed work in the tender heart! You may see a poor man, though he hath much ado to live, yet if his debts be discharged how glad he is, he can go abroad and fear no Sergeant to Arrest him, no writ issued out to attach him; and thus it is with a sinner repenting and believing; and if there be any whose heart is not ravished with this glorious mercy, it is to be feared he never felt the burden of sin, or else never strongly believed this gracious way of God. Let not then any Antinomian say, we put water into the believers wine, or wormwood into their bread; for who can rationally desire more then this doth amount to? but to expect such a *pardon*, such a *justification*, as that God shall *take no notice of sin*, to *chastice* or *afflict for it*, is to say, There is *forgiveness with God that he may* not *be feared*, contrary to *Davids* expression. 4.

Lect.

Lect. VII.

Arguments to prove, That God doth ſee ſinne in the Juſtified as to be offended and diſpleaſed with it.

Jerem. 50. 20.

In thoſe dayes, and at that time, the iniquity of Judah ſhall be ſought for, &c.

5. Fifthly, From this Scripture expreſſion is gathered, *That groſs ſins are are blotted out, as well as ſins of an inferiour nature;* Though there be ſins that waſte the *conſcience*, yet they do not waſte the *grace of remiſſion*; how is the true repentant affected with ſlaviſh fears ſometimes, as if his ſins did blot out Gods mercy like a *thick cloud?* as if our tranſgreſſions had ſubdued his goodnes, and *thrown it into the bottom of the ſea?* what a comfortable expreſſion is that *Iſa.* 1. 18. *Though your ſins be as ſcarlet, they ſhall be as white as ſnow?* &c. It was wonderfull mercy that ever ſo horrid, and bloudy ſinners (therefore their ſins are ſaid to be like ſcarlet) ſhould become ſo clear; yet the grace of Juſtification doth as *totally remit great ſins as leſſe ſins*, as Chriſt did with the ſame eaſineſs cure ſeveral diſeaſes. Thus *David* alſo *Pſal.* 51. after he had wallowed in that mire, he prayeth to be *purged*, in an alluſive expreſſion, *with hyſop*, which was the laſt thing uſed in their legal purifications, and therefore doth imply the *total* and *compleat cleanſing* by Chriſt, and upon this *David* ſaith, *He ſhall be whiter then ſnow*, which phraſe is neither with the

the Papiſt to be extended to *ſanctification*, as if ſuch perfect *clean righteouſneſs* were vouchſafed to him, as that there were *no ſin in him*; nor with the Antinomian, as if God did *quite aboliſh ſinne from David out of his ſight*, ſo as to take no *notice* of it, or *chaſtiſe* him for it (for after the pardon was paſt, yet his childe was to die, and much more evil to come to *Davids* houſe) but in reſpect of *final condemnation*, God having thus pardoned *David* through *Chriſt*, would no more adjudge him to everlaſting puniſhment, then he would one that was innocent, or without any ſpot of ſin. And this is to encourage great ſinners; ten thouſand talents was a great ſumme of money, yet how eaſily forgiven by that kinde Maſter? Thus *Exod.* 34.7. God is deſcribed forgiving ſins of all ſorts, and this he proclaimed, when his *glory paſſed by*; and how neceſſary is this for the contrite heart, which judgeth his ſins, becauſe of the aggravations of them to be unpardonable? If they had not been of ſuch a breadth, and depth, and length, they would not fear overwhelming as now they do. There are ſins of all ſorts deſcribed, and which is to be obſerved, God putteth no term, or bounds to his mercy, whereas he doth ſet ſome to his anger. Let not therefore the greatneſſe of ſin be thought more then the greatneſſe of mercy pardoning, and Chriſts obedience ſuffering; as it is hypocriſie to extenuate and make our ſins leſſe then they are, ſo it is unbelief to diminiſh his grace; and Gods greatneſs above us is as much celebrated in this his kindneſſe, as in any other Attribute. The ſins of all the world, if they were thy ſins, were but like a drop of water to his mercy, no more then our eſſence or power is to his Majeſty: Take heed then of ſaying Such and ſuch ſins may be forgiven, but can he forgive ſuch as mine are alſo?

Laſtly, In that *Honey-comb* (for we may ſay of theſe places, if of any, *they are ſweeter then honey*) this ſweetneſs may be preſſed out, *That all their ſins, though never ſo many, ſhall likewiſe be blotted out.* The ſea could as eaſily drown an whole hoſt of *Pharaohs* men, as twenty ſouldiers. The Apoſtle is exceellent (*Rom.* 5.) in this, making an oppoſition between the firſt *Adam* and ſecond, aggravating the ſuperlative power of the gift by grace, above the evil through ſin: Hence it is called, *The riches of his grace*, rather then *power* or *wiſdom*, becauſe of the plenty and a- 6.

bundance of it. Who would not think that while Gods goodnes in the Scripture is thus unfolded, there should not be a dejected unbelieving Christian in the world? Shall our sin abound to condemnation more then his grace to Justification? because sin is too strong for us, Is it therefore too much for the grace of God also? you see by this, that we may drink wine enough in the Scripture wine-cellars, to make our hearts glad, and yet swallow not down any dregs of Popish, or Antinomian dregs.

Arguments proving that God doth see sin so in the justified, as to be offended with it.

1 Rank of Arguments from Scripture.

These things thus explained, I come to confirm you with several Arguments, *That God doth see sin so as to be offended and displeased with it, in those that are already justified.*

And the first rank of Arguments shall be taken from those places of Scripture, where the godly do aggravate their sin, under this notion, *that it was in Gods sight*, that he especially *beheld it*, and was *offended with it*. And this aggravation the Prophet *Nathan* doth set home upon *David*, 2 Sam. 12 9. *Why hast thou despised the commandment of the Lord, to do this evil in his sight?* Now this would be a falshood by the Adversaries Doctrin, and not fit to be confessed by the justified; but rather to be looked upon as robbing God of his glory. Let us observe the places, *Ps.* 51 4. *Against thee, thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight*; Observe that, *in thy sight*; Therefore God did *see* and *take notice*, so as to be *displeased* with *David*; and of all considerations this did most wound and break his heart; so that indeed the Antinomian Doctrine doth properly overthrow that which is the choisest ingredient in godly sorrow, *viz. Because God is angry.* For what is *Davids* meaning but this, Although men do not know how wicked I was in the matter of *Uriah* and *Bathsheba*, yet thou dost; and although the world would flatter me, yet as long as thou art angry, I can have no peace. *Haec regula tenenda est, si vero poenitentia sensu imbui velimus*, saith *Calvin* upon the place, that is, *This rule is to be observed, when at any time we would be truly affected in a way of repentance.* This Argument seemeth to be cogent; but see what an answer the Antinomian giveth, whereby you may see that true of *Tertullian*, that besides the *Poetica* and *Pictoria*, *Tertia jam est, eaque haeretica licentia*, Besides the boldnesse of Poets and Painters to invent any thing, there is a third, and that is of Hereticks.

The

The Answer is this, *David doth here judge according to his sense and feeling, what he was to finde at Gods hand by the Law, so that he doth not speak this* (according to their Divinity) *in a way of faith, but sense and failing*; and therefore the Author doth compare this with that place *Ps.* 31.22. *I said in my haste, I am cut off.* O boldnes! Shall *David* be thought in haste and rashnes to say, *Against thee have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight?* Then all the other verses, *Have mercy on me, Thou delightest in truth*, may be said by *David* to be spoken in haste. How unpardonable is this error, to make that which was a special tenderness of godly sorrow upon *David*, to be a part of his humane weakness? *But* (saith the Author) *he speaketh in the Gospel-way afterwards, when he saith, Purge me, and I shall be whiter then snow*: But in what sense that is true, you have already heard; when a grosse actual sin is committed, is repented of, the sinfull act is quite passed away and gone, the guilt by forgivenesse is guite extinct, and so as to that respect, remission of sinne doth make us as white as snow. But it is not thus with original sin, whose guilt though removed, yet the proper stain of it doth stil abide. But of this more when we declare what that is which doth denominate a sinner. Therefore *David* doth not here speak *contradictions*, but his soul may be made *white by Justification*, and yet in the committing of new sins God be *angry*, and much *offended* with it.

Argum. 1. The Antinomian answer refelled. *Honey-comb*, p. 81.

A second Text to this purpose is, *Psal.* 90.8. *Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance.* Where *Moses* the Penman of the *Psalm*, speaks in the behalf of the Church then afflicted, that *God had put their sins before him*; so that God did not only take *notice* of them to *chastise them*, but he *put them before his eyes*. How the sin of a justified man may at the same time be covered, and yet put before God, is to be shewed in answering their Objections. And the Text, to put the matter out of all doubt, addeth in close, *They are before the light of his countenance*, which is very emphatical. God (as is to be shewed) hath in the Scripture a threefold eye, to our purpose, the eye of *Omniscience* (which the *Antinomian* will grant) and all agree in; the eye of his *anger*, which they deny; and an eye of *condemnation*, which the Papist pleads for. Now we go further then the *Antinomian*, we say, *God hath an eye of omniscience, and of anger,*

Argum. 2.

Antinomian evaſions anſwered.

upon the ſins of juſtified perſons; but not ſo far as the Papiſt, to ſay *he hath the eye of condemnation upon them.* You would think this Text ſtood unmovable; but let us hear how they would ſhake it?

1 Evaſion anſwered.

1. It may be ſaid, *That theſe are places in the Old Teſtament, whereas they ſpeak of believers under the New.*

I anſwer firſt, The chiefeſt places which they bring for ſeeing no ſin, are in the Old Teſtament. Thus *God ſeeth no iniquity in Jacob: Though your ſins be as ſcarlet, they ſhall be white as ſnow: Thou art all fair my love: Their ſins ſhall be blotted out.* Theſe places and the like were true in the Old Teſtament, and applied particularly to the godly Jews then living, by way of comfort to them, as the context plainly evidenceth.

2 Evaſion anſwered.

Secondly, (As I ſhewed in the Treatiſe of the Law) there can be no ſound reaſon given, why God ſhould ſee ſin in the juſtified perſon then, and not now: For did not God elect them from all eternity? Were not they in Chriſt, and their ſins laid upon Chriſt? Now theſe are the great Arguments why God ſeeth no ſin in believers (as they hold) and were not all theſe as verifiable upon the godly in the Old Teſtament?

2. It may be anſwered, *That Moſes ſpeaks here in the behalf of the whole Church then, and there were many among them that were not juſtified.* But this is eaſily taken away.

1. The Scripture ſpeaks univerſally, and *Moſes* reckoneth himſelf in the number with them.

2. The calamity was general, and who can ſay, none of the juſtified ſuffered under it? and this chaſtiſing of them, is that which is called ſetting of ſins before Gods face.

Laſtly, Some places of Scripture which they bring, and the chiefeſt ones, *for ſeeing no ſin in believers*, are univerſal, as this is, and ſpoken of the whole Church, thus my Text, *The iniquity of Judah and Iſrael ſhall be ſought for, and not found*: So God *ſeeth no iniquity in Jacob*, that is ſpoken of the body of them, when yet they muſt acknowledge, all were not juſtified among them.

I will name one place more in this rank, and that is *Luk.* 12. 21. where you have a confeſſion of a penitent ſon, *I have ſinned againſt heaven, and before thee.* This penitent was a ſon, and therefore calleth God *Father*; and indeed he could not ceaſe to be a ſon, therefore he doth not ſay, *I am not thy ſon*, but *I am not worthy*

thy to be called thy ſon. As for *Grotius* his obſervation upon the place, *Hæc fabula declarat, quod omnes homines ſunt ortu filij Dei, ſed eo jure excidunt ſemet à Deo alienando*, that is, *This fable declareth that all men are by birth the ſons of God, but they fall from that right, by alienating themſelves from God*, it deſerveth a double Animadverſion, one for calling this Parable *fabula*, which although in a critical notion, it may have a right ſenſe, yet uſe doth not now endure it; It would be very offenſive to call Chriſts Parables Chriſts Fables. 2. He ſheweth unſound Divinity, worſe then *Pelagians* or *Arminians*, as his very expreſſion declareth; (but to paſſe that) The Parable doth repreſent a godly man foully lapſed in ſin, and now returning to God, and he accuſeth himſelf, aggravating ſin, that his Father took notice of it; and whatſoever other Doctors teach, yet this is the beſt way for godly perſons repenting, to aggravate their ſinfulneſſe, in reference to Gods beholding of them, and being angry with them, *Quicunque ſibi ſe excuſat, accuſat Deo*, whoſoever excuſeth himſelf to himſelf, accuſeth himſelf to God, ſaid *Salvian* and *Tertul. In quantum non pepercèris tibi, in tantum tibi Deus (credè) parcet*, ſo much as thou ſhalt not ſpare thy ſelf, God (believe it) will ſpare thee.

Laſtly, This is to be obſerved, that after his Father had kiſſed him, which was a ſign of reconciliation and pardon; yet the ſon confeſſeth *he had ſinned againſt heaven, and before him.*

A ſecond rank of Arguments ſhall be from thoſe places where the Spirit of God is ſaid to *mortifie our ſins*, or we by his help to *crucifie our ſins*. If the Spirit of God do enable us to *crucifie* and *mortifie* ſin, as that which is an enemy, and loathſom to him, then notwithſtanding Chriſts righteouſnes imputed, God doth take notice of that which is filthy, and to be removed in the godly: But we are aſſiſted by Gods Spirit to this, *Ergo*. Rom. 8. 11, 13. *If ye by the Spirit mortifie the deeds of the body*, Gal. 5. 18. *If ye be led by the Spirit, ye ſhall not fulfill the deeds of the fleſh.* In theſe words are two plain Concluſions, 2 Rank of Arguments from Scripture.

Firſt, *That the godly have ſtill ſins in them*, for theſe are called the *deeds of the fleſh*. By deeds of the fleſh are not meant groſſe ſins, but all the inward motions and thoughts of the ſoul corrupted.

Secondly, That the Spirit of God *seeth them, takes notice of them*, they are loathsom to him, and therefore he *mortifieth* them. Now the Spirit of God being the same with God, that which he mortifieth, must needs be taken notice of by him as offensive.

The Antinomians Answer confuted.

To this, what do they answer?

They say, *We do not mortifie sin, no not by Gods Spirit, out of of Gods sight, but only out of our own sight; so that when the Spirit of God overcometh a corruption in us, this is not by removing it out of Gods sight but our own only*, Hony-comb, p. 164. *For* (say they) *Christs righteousnesse being made ours, we are all clean before God, and that which the Spirit of God doth afterwards in* sanctification, *is cleansing away sin only* declaratively *before men*. Hence (as you heard) they distinguish of a twofold *cleansing*, one *secret* and *mystical by Christs righteousnesse*, and the other *palpable* and *grosse to our sense and feeling*, which is by *Gods Spirit in us*; but here are many mistakes and errours.

1. That they oppose *Christs cleansing*, and the *Spirits cleansing* together; for what *Christs blood* doth *meritoriously* cleanse away, the same *Christs Spirit* doth by *efficacious application*. Hence Christ by his death doth quite remove sin, in respect of the guilt of it here on earth, and doth give his Spirit to crucifie the power of it; so that both *Christs cleansing*, and the *Spirits cleansing*, do relate to Gods sight: for it is Gods will that we should not only be clean by imputed righteousnesse, but also by inherent holinesse.

2. It is false, that we only mortifie sin *declaratively to men*, for it is *really* and indeed done, even to *Godward*. Hence this is the great difference between a *pharisaical*, or *external mortification*, and a *spiritual*: The former is from humane principles to humane motives; the other is from God, and to God, and through God: so that as that is not a divine Faith, but humane, which is not from a divine principle, and because of Divine Authority; so neither can that be divine and spiritual mortification, which is not from divine efficiency, and because of divine grounds. Hereby it is that the whole work of Grace is called a *new creature*, and it is a new creature not only *manward*, but *Godward*, and who can think when *Ephes.* 4. we are exhorted *to put on the*

new

new man, which after God is created in righteousnesse, that any other sense can be drawn out of it, then that, *the putting off the old man, and putting on the new*, have relation to God as well as man? It is therefore well observed by *Musculus* on the former Text, that both these are put together, *If ye through the Spirit do mortifie*; *we* and the *Spirit*. *The Spirit*, and that sheweth all the Popish means of *mortification* to be unprofitable, the Spirit of God neither appointing them, or working by them: Then he addeth *ye*, denoting that we also are to work and act (being first quickned with a spiritual life put into us) and not as some do now dangerously maintain, give up all, expecting the operation of the Spirit only.

3. The falshood of this Assertion will further appear; If the Spirit of God by *mortification* doth not *remove sin out of us* as to *Gods sight*, then by further *sanctification*, *it brings no good thing into us as to Gods sight likewise*: and thus as God shall see no sin in his people, so neither no good thing inherently in his people; for this must necessarily follow by their principles, as God *takes no notice of sin inherent in believers to be angry with them*, so likewise *no notice of inherent grace to be well-pleased with them*; for if the Spirit of God do not cleanse our corruption from Gods sight, then still the more corruption is washed away, God still doth no wayes approve that holinesse, but it is only the imputed holiness of Christ, which he regards. Therefore he that maintaineth *God seeth no sin in believers to chastise*, must maintain *he seeth no graces in them to reward them*; and take their own similitude, as he (say they) that looks thorow a red glasse seeth every thing in it red; if there be dirt in it, it looks red, if there be pearls in it, it looketh red, all is one to the sight; so when God looketh upon us in Christ, if there be sin, if there be our own inherent holinesse, it is all one, God seeth only Christs holinesse. Thus while the *Antinomian* laboureth to have our sins covered from Gods eyes, he likewise spreads a covering over all the fruits of Gods Spirit in us, that they shall not be taken notice of: whereas none ever denied but that the graces of Gods people are acceptable to him, though not to Justification; and many promises he makes to them, the Imperfection being done away by Christ. But in their way, as God takes no notice of *Pauls* sinful motions to be offended

offended at them, so neither of all his labourings and sufferings in the Gospel-way.

Lastly, If the Spirit of God do only *mortifie, as to our feeling*, and not to *Gods sight*, then when the soul departs into glory, all that *inherent purity*, must only be *declaratively* also; but in heaven we are made holy *perfectly in Gods sight*, and that without any imputed righteousnesse of Christ, though Christ did purchase and obtain that for us. Now what the Spirit of God doth finish and consummate upon the souls dissolution, he had begun even in this life.

Argum. 3. Rev. 2. 18. Jam. 4. 9, 10. 2 Cor. 7. 9, 10.

A third sort of Arguments is from those places which commend repentance, humiliation, and godly sorrow for sin; for if God takes no *notice* of our sin, be not *offended* at it, we may indeed be sorrowfull for sin because of men, but not because of God. Shall I be sorrowfull because God is offended when he is not offended? shall I weep because God is angry when he is not angry? If you ask *Peter* why he weeps bitterly, will he not say, because he offended God? If you ask the *Corinthians*, why they are so deeply humbled, will not they say, because by their sins they provoked God to bring temporal calamities upon them? so that the poisonous nature of this doctrine, appeareth in nothing more then in this, it taketh away all grounds of *humiliation and repentance of sin* in those that do *believe*. Therefore mark it, he that saith, *There is no sin in the Church of God now* (which is their expresse opinion) he must likewise say, there is no *godly sorrow* in the Church of God now. For what is the reason there can be no godly sorrow in heaven, there was none in the state of innocency, but because there was no sin there? and it must be thus now in the Church of God. This error eateth into the vitals of godlinesse, therefore beware of it. Say, I will have no such free grace, as shall take away godly sorrow; remember the gracious promise, *Zech.* 12. where God promiseth *a spirit of prayer and mourning for sin*, as well as to blot out sin, he shall not obtain the promise for the later that feeleth not the promise for the former. And certainly if this Doctrine were true, why did *Paul* say, Though I made you sorry, I did not repent: We Ministers ought to repent, that ever we made you sorry; and you are to repent that ever you have been sorrowfull.

A fourth

A fourth kinde is from all those places, where God is said so to *take notice* of the *sins of justified persons*, as that he doth *grievously afflict them for their transgressions*. This Argument doth properly and directly overthrow the whole *Antinomian* Assertion; but because I have largely proved this already, I will not insist on it. To make good their Assertion, *That God seeth no sin*, they are forced also to hold, *That all the afflictions upon the godly are only trials of their faith, preservatives from sin, but not correctives for sin.* But did not God see sin in *Moses*, when for his unbelief he kept him out of *Canaan*? Did not he see sin in *David*, though pardoned, grievously chastising him afterwards? Did he not see sin in *Jonah*, who would fain have run from Gods face, that he might not have seen him? Did he not see sin in the *Corinthians*, when many of them were sick and weak, for abusing the Ordinances, yet many of them were such, that therefore were chastened, that they might not be condemned of the Lord. *Argum. 4*

There are more Arguments, but at this time I conclude with a Use of Exhortation to broken-hearted and contrite sinners, again and again to meditate upon the great and glorious expressions which the Scripture useth about forgiveness of sinne. Your fears and doubts are so great, that only such great remedies can cure you. Tell me ye afflicted and wounded for sin. Is not this the best oil that can be poured into your sores? Tell me ye spiritual *Lazarus's*, that lie at the gate of God daily, who is rich in mercy, desiring the very crums that fall from this Table of grace, Are you thankfull because God provideth food and raiment, and not much rather because of a pardon? How great is Gods goodnesse! he might have removed us out of his sight, and he hath done so to our sins; he might have thrown us into the bottom of hell, and he hath cast our iniquities into the bottom of the sea; he might have blotted our names out of the book of life, and he hath blotted out our sins from his remembrance.

Lect. VIII.

Jerem. 50. 20.

In those dayes, and at that time the iniquity of Judah shall be sought for, and it shall not be found, &c.

V. Rank of Arguments.

A Fifth rank of Arguments, is from those places of Scripture, wherein the people of God in their petitions and supplications, do necessarily imply this Truth, *that God seeth, taketh notice, and is angry with their sins.* Now all *Petitions* use to be in a two-fold *faith*, one *applicative* and *fiduciall*, the other *doctrinall* and *assentive*, which is the foundation of the former. If a Papist pray for the deliverance of any out of purgatory, it is a vain prayer, because there is not a *theologicall verity* to ground his prayer upon: thus a Socinian cannot truly pray to God in Christ, because he hath not a *dogmaticall* or *assenting faith* to the truth of Christs Divine nature, and so cannot have a *fiduciall faith* in the same.

Thus it would be with the people of God, how can they in their prayers intreat God *to turn away his anger from them, to hide his face from their sins*, if he were not indeed *angry?* Now that the Petitions of Gods people are for this end, will appear by several places. I shall not here mention that Petition we are directed to in the Lords prayer, *viz. Forgive us our sins*, for that is a noble instance, and deserveth a single consideration of its self; but we have many other instances, as *Psal.* 51. 9. *Hide thy face from my sins.* Its plain by this prayer, Gods *face*, and so his *eyes was upon Davids sins though justified*, and that a godly man falling into grievous *sins*, hath them not *presently covered* from Gods eyes; for his meaning by this phrase, is, that God *would not regard them to visit them on him*, the contrary whereof is *Psal.* 119. 15. *Let their sin be continually before thee*; and this

is

is observable, that *David* doth again and again Petition for *pardon*, whereby is shewed how difficult a thing it is to obtain the favour of God, after we have offended him by our sins. Neither let that be replied, That this is done by *believers* in the *Old Testament*; for *Paul* bringeth a proof from *Psal.* 32. 1. to shew what is the nature of *Justification*, even under the *Gospel*. And that I may once for all dissolve this objection of theirs, I shall handle distinctly this question, *Whether the Justification of believers under the Old Testament and New, be not uniform and altogether the same*, which is to be affirmatively maintained, and therefore remit you to that question. For the present, we see how *David* here doth twice and thrice with much vehemency desire that Gods *face would not be upon his sins*. Here may be one considerable question made, Seeing *Nathan* the Prophet had told *David* his sin was forgiven him; was not this great unbelief and diffidence, to pray for pardon after that consolation? To this it may be answered,

Question considerable propounded.

1. That *Nathans* comfort might be given after this penitential Psalm: for although 2 *Sam.* 12. 13. the History makes mention of *Nathans* oyl poured into *David*, as soon as ever he was wounded, yet it is a frequent thing in Scripture to have those things immediatly connected in story, when yet there was a great distance in the practise. But grant it was immediatly upon *Davids* repentance; yet *faith* in God *for pardon* may well stand with *prayer for pardon*; The deep sense and feeling of Gods offence, cannot but provoke to earnest Petition, though faith at the same time perswadeth the heart God will hear: Hence *David* doth not here pray in unbelief, thinking God would not pardon him, therefore some translate, *v.* 7. in the future tense, *Thou will purge me with hyssop*, because of his assurance. Again, though God *removed Davids sin* in respect of *condemnation*, yet not in respect of *all other effects of his anger*, for so his sin did still lye as a burden on him, and in this respect he still seeketh Gods face. In the next place consider, *Psal.* 32. 1, 3, 4. Of all parts of the Scripture, the Psalms have this excellency, that they do in a lively experimentall way set forth the gracious works of God upon the soul, and *David* doth in many Psalms, still as it were play upon the Harp, to drive out the evil spirit of unbelief and

diffidence out of a mans heart. Now this Psalm is a most excellent directory for the obtaining of pardon after sin committed, wherein *David* being for a while grievously crushed by Gods anger for his sins, at last feeling the sunshine of his favour breaking through the Clouds, he doth in the beginning of the same, joyfully break out, admiring the happiness of those who have their sins pardoned, and he doth in severall words repeat the same benefit, because of the excellency of it: and certainly were your hearts touched with the sense of Gods displeasure for sin, neither riches, nor good trading, or any advantage in the world, would so glad your heart, as to have a pardon of sin. For how soeth *David* to be thus affected with forgivens of his sins, even because he confessed it not, was not humbled under it, till Gods wrath was heavy upon him, and then he resolved to acknowledge it, whereupon God immediatly forgiveth him. Now lest any should think, What is this to us in the *times of the Gospel?* observe *v.6. For this every one that is godly shall pray unto thee*; that is, for this remission, for this pardon every one that is godly shall pray; so that its *ungodliness* by *Davids* judgement not to *confess sin*, or to *pray for the pardon*, which how can any Antinomian do by his principles, that holdeth, *God seeth not, or taketh notice, so as to be offended with the sins of justified persons?* and so they are not only Antinomists, but Anti-Confessionists, Anti-Petitionists, and Anti-Penitents.

Take one more instance, *Ps.6.1.* where *David* prayeth God would *not rebuke him in his hot displeasure:* Compare this with *Jer.10 24.* where you see the servants of God do suppose an anger from God will fall on them for their sins, and they do not refuse his rebukes, only they desire God would moderate, and set bounds to his wrath, that it may not overwhelm them. Many other places there are, where its plain, the people of God praying, do suppose him to be *angry* with them for their *sins*, and it is a truth so ingraven in the heart of a godly man, that no error can ever quite obliturate it.

VI. Argument. A sixth sort of Arguments shall be from those places, where God is said *to take notice of our sin, more then we can or do*, 1 Joh. 3.18,19,20. where the Apostle presseth beleevers to a sincere love of one another with this Argument, that *hereby we shall assure*

assure our hearts before him; the Greek word signifieth to *perswade*, and doth excellently set forth the difficulty of being assured in Gods presence. Now this great benefit he illustrates by the contrary, *if our hearts condemn us, God is greater then our hearts*; and this holdeth universally in every holy duty, as well as that of love: if our hearts condemn us for hypocrisie, and insincerity in them, God doth much more, for *he knoweth more evil by our selves then we do*. Now how can this Apostolicall assertion be true, if so be God *took no notice, or were not offended at the sins of his people?* Its an argument of sweet meditation to humble us, that if where there is but a drop of grace, our sins are so loathsom and offensive; how much more must they be to the ocean of all purity? To this the Antinomian replieth, (*Honey-Comb* p.89.) that *John* speaks this of *hypocrites* and not the *justified children of God*; but first, he gives the express title of *little children* to them, *v.*18. and *my little children*, so that he taketh upon him the bowels of a father to them. Again, let it be granted, that he describes *hypocrites*, yet there is no *godly man* but this text will in some sense belong to; for there is no man so godly, but he hath some hypocrisie and insincerity in his best love: there is that worm in his best fruit, that dross in his best gold. It followeth then by proportion, that so far as the godly do discern imperfections, and insincerity in their duties, so farre they are to be humbled before God, who knoweth much more by them then they discern; as you see little moats are discerned by the sun beams in the Air, which were not discerned before: therefore when *John* addeth, *If our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence with God*, his meaning is not, as if we could have no confidence where our hearts do condemn us in some degrees, for then none in the world could have confidence; but he speaks of condemning our selves, upon a discovery of a total and wilfull hypocrisie, and so we will indeed grant that he speaks of hypocrites, but yet it proveth as much as we desire, namely, that where there is any condemnation of our selves for any degree of insincerity in any duty, we are to tremble, and to remember that God is greater then our hearts, knoweth more by us, and so his wrath might break out hotter then we can imagin. Neither is the former answer weakened, though we grant it to

Antinomian Objections answered.

be understood of totall hypocrites, for it is usuall with the Apostle to threaten even those that are godly, and dear to him, with the condition and punishment of hypocrites and apostates, as *Heb.*6. See another instance, 1 *Cor.*4.4. *I know nothing by my self, yet am I not thereby justified, for it is God that judgeth me*; where the Apostle doth not speak of an Anabaptisticall perfection, as if *Paul knew no sin by himself*; but his meaning is to be restrained to the *faithfull dispensation of the office committed to him*, in which though he had not *perfection*, yet his *conscience* did not *accuse* him of *gross negligence* or *unfaithfulness*; but for all this he doth not think himself *justified* by any *godliness in him*; and why so? because *God judgeth him*, who *takes notice of*, and is *offended* with more sins then he understands by himself; so that *Paul* doth acknowledge God to *see sin in him*, and therefore he cannot be *justified* by any thing *inherent*; and this made *Bernard* say excellently, *Tutior est justitia donata, quam inhærens*, Imputed righteousnes is safer to rely upon then inherent. Think it therefore a small thing to be acquitted by Antinomian principles, when it is God that judgeth; and whatsoever the adversary speaketh about a righteousnes of Christ communicated unto us, so that thereby God *seeth no sin*; yet because they say, he *seeth no sin* in us *inherently*, they must conclude for some perfect *inherent righteousnes*. Lastly, *Psal.*19. *David* crying out, *who can understand his errors?* prayeth thereupon, *cleanse thou me from secret sins*; and this doth imply that there were many sins that *David* had, which were loathsom and foul in Gods eyes, though undiscovered by himself, and therefore he would have God wash him, and make him clean.

VII. Rank of Arguments.

A seventh rank of Arguments shall be from those places wherein God hath commanded Ministers to *binde* and *retain* the *sins* of *scandalous offendors*, and hath promised to *ratifie them in heaven, which they according to his will, do on earth*. Experience witnesseth that a justified person may fall into some scandalous sin, whereby the whole Congregation may be much offended, and God highly provoked. Now in this case God hath commanded the Ministers of the Gospel to binde and to retain such a mans sins till he doth repent. This *binding* is not by way of *authority*, but *ministeriall* declaration, and effectuall application

of

of Gods threatnings in his word to such a person sinning, and when this is done, God hath promised, that all this shall be ratified and made good in heaven against that man. Now how can God make good the Ministers threatnings applied to that godly man, if he take not notice, and be not offended with the person so heinously sinning? The places that prove such a *binding* of sin, and Gods ratifying of their sentence, are *John* 20.23. *Mat.*16.19. *Mat.*18.18. Can any man say, that when a godly man is cast out of Gods family, the seals of Gods grace denied him, and he delivered up to Satan, that God is not angry with him? yea, is not he bound then to apprehend God estranged from him? when a godly man is excommunicated, he is not only cast out from the *external* Church society, but likewise there is a deprivation from *internall* communion with Christ; not as if he were cut off from the purpose or decree of Gods election, or as if the habituall seed of grace were quite extinct in him, but only as the outward seals of Gods favour are denied him; so also doth God being angry with him, deny him any inward testimonies of his favour; and it would not be faith against sense (as the Adversary cals it) but presumption against Scripture to say, God was at that time well pleased with him; yea Divines say (*Synopsis pura Theol. disp.*48.) that there is a conditional exclusion of the person so offending from future glory, for the Church threatens him, that as they judge him now, and bid him depart from their society, so if he do not repent, Christ at the last day will command him to depart from his presence, and the holy Angels, according to that of *Tertul. in Apologetico. Summum futuri judicii præjudicium est, si quis ita deliquerit, ut à communicatione orationis & conventus, & omnis sancti commercii relegetur.*

The eighth kinde of Arguments is from those places, where Christ is said still to be *an advocate*, and *to make intercession* for *believers* after they are *justified*, which would be altogether needless, if God did not take notice of their sins, and were ready to charge them upon believers; consider the places, 1 *Joh.*2.1. *Heb.*7.25. In the former place *John* having said, that *Christs blood cleanseth us from all sin.* (a place the Antinomian much urgeth, not considering that at the same time, the Apostle *v.*9. requireth VIII. Kind of Arguments.

quireth *confession* and *shame* in our selves, if we would have pardon) in the first verse of the second Chapter, he saith, *he writes these things that they should not sin*; all true doctrine about Christ and free-grace tendeth to the demolishing, & not incouraging of sin, but the Apostle supposeth such fragility that we will sin, and therefore speaketh of a remedy, *If we sin we have an advocate*; now this makes severall waies against the Antinomian.

First, That sins committed after our *Justification* need an *advocate*; it is not enough that we were once justified, our new sins would condemn us for all that, were it not for Christ.

Secondly, In that Christ is an *advocate*, it supposeth that though God be a *Father* to his people, yet he is also a *Judge*, and that he so taketh *notice of*, and is *displeased* with their sins, that did not Christ intercede and deprecate the wrath of God, it would utterly consume them. Thou therefore who saiest God the Father is not *offended*, why then doth Christ perform the Office of an *advocate*? If thy sins be not brought into the Court, what need any pleading for thee? In the other place, *Heb.7.25.* The Apostle acknowledgeth a two-fold function of Christs Priestly Office: The one is, the *offering up of himself for our sins*. The second is the *continual intercession for us*, which the Apostle *Ch.9.v.24.* calleth *appearing before Gods face in our behalf*; now we must not so advance Christs sufferings in the *taking away* of sin, so as to exclude the other part of his Priestly Office, which is *continually to plead our cause for us*: for the Apostle makes Christ to stand before the face of God, as some great favourite before an earthly Prince, to plead in the behalf of those who are accused; so that the Doctrine which denieth God *seeing of sin in his people*, doth wholly overthrow *Christs intercession*, and the efficacy of it. Concerning the manner of Christs intercession, it is not to be conceived in that way as he prayed here upon the earth; but it is his holy will and expres desire of his soul, that God the Father should be reconciled with those for whom he hath shed his blood: and truly that point of Divinity, *viz.* Christs affections and sympathizing with his people now in heaven, is an ocean of infinite comfort.

Lect.

Lect. IX.

How greatly God is offended at the ſins of thoſe that are Godly.

Jerem. 50. 20.

In thoſe dayes, and at that time, the iniquity of Judah ſhall be ſought for, &c.

IX. Sort of Arguments.

I Shall now conclude with the laſt ſort of Arguments, which are from thoſe Scriptures that ſpeak how God is *affected with his people when they have ſinned*, which *affections* do neceſſarily imply Gods *ſeeing of ſin*, ſo as to be *angry with them*, yea in ſome reſpects Gods anger is more to them then others, and we ſay, in ſome ſenſe God doth *more ſee* and take notice of the *ſins of believers then others*.

The places of Scripture which ſpeak in what manner God takes the ſinnes of believers, are theſe, *Epheſ.* 4. 30. *Grieve not the holy Spirit of God*, &c. where the godly in their ſinnes are ſaid to *grieve Gods Spirit*. Now can the *Spirit of God*, which is alſo God, be *grieved* (to ſpeak after the manner of men) at our ſinnes, and not *take notice of them?* Certainly, if they grieve God, they ought to grieve us, let us not neglect that which the Spirit of God is ſo offended with. This place ſeemeth to be taken out of *Iſaiah* 63. 10. *They vexed his holy Spirit*. So that it is ſuch a grieving, as doth vex and imbitter the holy Spirit of God. O what a dreadfull conſideration ſhould this be againſt all falſhoods in this point? Doth not God, Doth not the Spirit of God take notice of thy corru-

ptions, and yet be grieved and vexed at them? Furthermore the aggravation of this sinne is seen, in that it is against the Spirit that doth *seal us to the day of redemption.* A Metaphor (saith *Zanchy in locum*) from Merchants, who having bought such goods, seal them as their own, that so leaving others, they may transport them. Now for the godly to sinne, it is to deface this seal, and if it be so great an offence to violate humane seals, how much more Divine? Observe likewise that passage of God to *Moses*, Exod. 4. 14. where *Moses* out of the sense of his infirmity, refusing the office God called him to twice or thrice, it is said, *The Lords wrath was kindled against him.* In the *Hebrew* it is very emphatical, *The fury of the Lord was angry against Moses*, and the Septuagint Θυμωθεὶς ὀργῇ κύριος, by which expression was signified, God was not lightly, but grievously angry with him, so *Psal.* 74. 1. The Church crieth out, *Why doth thine anger smoke against the sheep of thy pasture?* and in many other places. Now can God be *angry*, and that in so high a degree, with that which he doth *not see*, or *take notice of?* It is true. *Isidor. Pelus. lib.* 1. *Ep.* 144. will not suffer, that *notice* and *affliction* which God layeth upon us, to be called ὀργὴν or ἐκδίκησιν but then anger is to be taken in a strict sense, for *punishment by way of Satisfaction*, but otherwise the Scripture doth frequently use this word, and that of God to his own people, yea *vengeance* which is more, *Psal.* 99. 8. But that it may the better appear, how great the guilt of sinne in believers, even in the sight of God, is, and what his account is of it, take notice of these particulars,

Particulars expressing how great the guilt of sin is in believers even in Gods sight.

1. First, What the Scripture styles them, 1 *Sam.* 2. 29. There God reproveth *Eli* in his indulgence about his sonnes, with this remarkable expression, *Thou honourest thy sonnes above me.* Is not this an aggravation which *God taketh notice of?* and yet *Eli* did reprove his son, but because he failed in the measure of zeal, therefore is God thus angry with him; so that God doth not only *see the grosse sinnes committed by his people*, but a *lesse measure of their graces*, and is angry for that. So *Revel.* 2. because the Church abated in her *first love*, and her *works* were not *perfect*, therefore doth God threaten her. As the

the godly are said to honour the creature above him when they sinne, so they are likewise said to *despise* God; and can God but be *offended* with them that *despise* him? 1 *Sam.* 2 13. *They that despise me, shall be lightly esteemed*, saith God again to *Eli*. Thus likewise to *David*, 2 Sam. 12. 9. *Wherefore hast thou despised the commandment of the Lord?* God cannot but *take notice of* that which is a *despising*, and contemning of him. As their sinnes are a *despising* of God, so are they said to *displease* God, which cannot be if God *see no sinne*; for if God *see no sinne*, it is all one in reference to God, whether a believer wallow in the mire of sinne, or whether he live holily; so that this Doctrine must needs eat and consume like a Gangrene. Is God as well pleased with *Peter denying Christ*, as *Peter repenting?* as much pleased with *David* in his *adultery* and *murder*, as when making his *penitential Psalm?* The Papists indeed would fasten such prodigious consequences upon the Protestants Doctrine, but they abhorre it, whereas it followeth naturally from the Antinomian Assertion. Indeed the Orthodox say, *David and Peter in their lapses, did not fall from the state or grace of Justification*; but wherein the Antinomian and they differ, is hereafter to be shewen. That God is thus displeased with *Justified persons, when they* thus *sinne*, is plain, 2 *Sam.* 11. 29. where what we translate (*displeased*) according to the Originall, is, *Was evil in the eyes of the Lord*; where you see expresse Scripture, that God did *see sinne in David*, because that which he had done, was *evil in Gods eyes*: So again, 1 *Chron.* 21. 7. *Davids* numbering of the people, is said to be *evil in the eyes of the Lord*. Thus the very letter of the Scripture is against them. Lastly, Their *sinnes* are *offences against God*, and can God be *offended* with that which he doth not *behold? Elihu* speaks true and excellent Doctrine, *Job* 34. 32. though he erred in the application, *Surely it is meet to be said unto God, I have born chastisement, I will offend no more*, where he acknowledgeth, that *chastisements* are *for sinnes*, and that *sinnes* are *offences*. If then the *sinnes of Gods people* are a *dishonour* to him, a *despising* of him, a *displeasing* of him, they *are evil in his eyes*,

and an *offence* to him, it cannot be, but that he must *see sinne in his people.*

2. Secondly, *The Scripture describeth Gods threatning and upbraiding of them with all his kindnesses he did to them*; so that God doth not onely *take notice of them, but in the several aggravations of their ingratitude and unkindenesse unto him, in all that they offend.* Thus observe Gods dealing with *Eli*, 1 Sam. 2. 28. *Did not I choose thy father out of all the Tribes of Israel to be my Priest, to offer upon my Altar? Did I not give unto thy father all the Offerings by fire of the children of Israel? Wherefore kick ye at my Sacrifice?* What a cutting sword must this needs be in *Elies* heart? and because the children of God have a Spirit of love in them, these upbraidings must needs wound their heart the more. Again, see the like dealing with *David*, 2 Sam. 11. 12, 8, 9. *I annointed thee King over Israel, and I delivered thee out of the hand of Saul: and if that had been too little, I would have given thee such and such things, wherefore hast thou despised the Commandment of God?* &c. Must not this pierce into the very bowels of *David?* Shall God upbraid his people falling into sinne, spread before their eyes the manifold mercies he hath bestowed upon them, and all this while *see no sinne in them?* Therefore when it is said *James* 1. 5. That *God upbraideth not*, that is to be understood, in respect of his *frequent* and *liberall giving*, as men use to say, I have given thus often, and I will give no more; which kinde of giving *Seneca* cals *panem lapidosum*; but if men walk unworthy of the benefits received, he doth then upbraid, as *Mark* 16. 14. He is said to upbraid the Disciples, because of their unbelief.

3. Thirdly, The Scripture applieth the *threatnings of God to believers, as well as to others*, making no difference between them, unlesse they repent. Indeed we say against the Papists, That all the *sinnes* of *Justified persons* are *venial*, and not *mortal*, that is, such as in the event will have pardon, but that is, because the seed of grace will be operative in them, so that they shall either *habitually*,

or *actually* repent of their sinnes. Neither when the Orthodox say, That *Election* is *absolute*, do they exclude the *Media Instituta*, means appointed by God, in which the fruit of Election is accomplished, but *Conditions antecedaneous*, as if that Decree did remain suspense and uncertain, till the will of man had determined, 1 *Cor.*6.9,10. The Apostle layeth down an universal Rule, Such and such grosse offenders *shall not inherit the Kingdome of Heaven*, that is, those who live so and do not repent: and this is to be extended not onely to those who are *habitually* so, but *actually* likewise, unlesse they are reformed. Therefore no godly man falling into any of those grosse sinnes, may deceive himself, and and think he shall enter into the Kingdome of Heaven without a change. Godly or ungodly, yet if found in the committing of such a grosse sinne, unlesse they do repent, God will not accept one or the other. As *Repentance* is appointed for the *wicked man* as a duty, without which he cannot be saved; so *confession* and *forsaking of sinne*, is prescribed a *godly* man fallen into sinne, without which he cannot have remission, 1 *John* 1.9. There is no such free-grace or Gospel, as saith to a believer, if fallen into a foul sinne, Whether you repent or no, your sinnes shall be pardoned to you. Hence 1 *Cor.* 11. the Apostle makes every man that receiveth *unworthily* (and yet some of them were godly) *to receive their damnation*, that is, their *eternal damnation*, *without repentance* and *Reformation*; and after *repentance*, their *judgement*, though not of *condemnation*, yet *affliction* and *castigation*. How terrible likewise is *Paul*? Heb.12.29. where speaking to the *godly* that are to receive a Kingdom that is eternal, he exhorteth them to duty, *Let us have grace* (ἔχωμεν χάριν) that is, *Let us retain and keep grace*, ἔχωμεν is for κατέχωμεν, as *Rom.* 15.4. and observe the manner, *with reverence and godly fear*, εὐλαβεία is such a *fear* as relateth to *punishment*; compare this place with *Psal.*2.12. and thus the words following suppose, *for our God is a consuming fire*, this is taken out of *Deuter.* 4. 24. and the meaning is, *God is no lesse angry with Christians sinning against him, then formerly with the Israelites*, and it is as easie

for him to deſtroy whom he is offended with, as for the fire to deſtroy ſtubble. How directly doth this place overthrow that Antinomian Aſſertion, *God ſaw ſinne in believers in the Old Teſtament, and therefore afflicted them, but it is not ſo under the New?*

Now, when its ſaid, *God is a conſuming fire*, this denoteth the great *anger* of God, compare it with *Deut.* 9.3. and *Deut.* 32.22. Fire is moſt efficacious, and leaſt capable of tranſmutation as other elements are, for which reaſon the *Perſians* worſhipped fire for a god; but fire might be extinguiſhed, whereas God is ſuch a fire as conſumeth all and remaineth immutable. Know then (Brethren) that as there are places in the New Teſtament, which ſpeak of the *riches of his grace*, ſo alſo of his *conſuming anger*. As therefore the *Promiſes* of the Scripture are for *Conſolation* and *Hope to the Godly*, ſo are the *threatnings* for a *godly fear*. Between theſe two milſtones a Chriſtian is made *Dulcis farina*, as *Luther* once ſaid; and neither of theſe milſtones may be taken for a pledge, as the Law was in the Old Teſtament; becauſe one cannot work without the other. Therefore for a man to take onely thoſe places of Scripture, which ſpeak of the *goodneſſe of the Promiſes*, and to reject the *terrours of the threatnings*, is ſpiritual theft in an high degree. Doth not *Paul*, 2 Cor. 5. excite himſelf to run like a gyant in his miniſterial race, becauſe of the *terrour of the Lord* at the day of judgement? See *verſ.* 10. *We muſt all appear* (ſo to appear, as to be ſeen through and made manifeſt) *before the judgement ſeat of God* (as thoſe that are to plead a cauſe in an eminent place before a Judge) *to receive a reward ſuitable to his life: Now knowing this* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *we perſwade*; it may relate to himſelf, and to thoſe whom he perſwadeth. Yet this apprehenſion of the Lords terror did not exclude love, for *v.*14. he ſaith, *The love of Chriſt conſtraineth us*, συνέχει, either an expreſſion from thoſe who had a ſpirit of Prophecy upon them, that was very powerfull, whereby they could not but ſpeak, or elſe from women in travell, *Heb.* 12. 15. which through pain cannot but cry out, ſo efficacious was love in *Paul.*

4. Fourthly, *The ſinnes of godly men ceaſe not to be ſins, though they*

they are juſtified. We may not ſay, that in *Cain* killing of another is murder, but in *David* it is not: We may not ſay denying of Chriſt in *Judas*, is indeed a ſinne, but in *Peter* it is not. No priviledge they have by Juſtification can alter the nature of a ſinne. *He that receiveth unworthily, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord,* whether he be a wicked man, or a believer. It is not with a believer and a wicked man, as with a man and a beaſt comparatively. If a beaſt kill a man, it is not ſinne, becauſe the ſubject is not reaſonable, but a man if he do ſo, whether godly or ungodly, it is a ſinne, becauſe againſt Gods Law. It is not ſafe to ſay, That God doth with the believer and wicked, as if a Magiſtrate ſhould make a Law, that whoſoever committeth ſuch a crime, if he be a freeman he ſhall only be impriſoned; but if a ſervant, he ſhall be put to death: So God, whoſoever murdereth or committeth adultery, if he be a believer, the wages due to his ſinne, is onely temporall chaſtiſements, but to a wicked man, its eternal death. I ſay, this is not ſafe: For although a believers ſinne ſhall not actually damn him, yet God hath made the ſame Law to both, and repentance as a means is preſcribed, ſo that we may by ſuppoſition ſay, If the wicked man repent, his ſinne ſhall not damn him; If the juſtified perſon do not, his ſinne will damn him. It is true, it is not proper to ſay of ſinne in the abſtract, it ſhall be damned, no more then that grace ſhall be ſaved; but we are to ſay, the perſon ſhall be damned or ſaved. Yet the guilt of the ſinne, will cauſe the guilt of the perſon, if not taken off by Chriſt, as the *meritorious*, and faith as the *inſtrumental cauſe.* The ſins then of *believers* and *ungodly* are both alike, only that the guilt of them doth not redound upon the perſons alike, is becauſe the one takes the way appointed by God to obtain pardon, and the other doth not. Not that the godly man makes himſelf to differ from the wicked, but all is the work of grace. In ſome reſpects the ſins of godly men are more offenſive to God, then thoſe of wicked men; becauſe committed againſt more light, and more experience of the ſweetneſſe of Gods love, and the bitterneſſe of ſin. What is the cauſe *Heb.* 10.28,29,30. the Apoſtle maketh the condition of a wilfull apoſtate to be ſo dreadfull, but becauſe of the excellency

of

of the object in the Goſpel, above that in the Law? *If he that deſpiſed Moſes his Law, died without mercy, of how much ſorer puniſhment, ſuppoſe ye ſhall he be thought worthy?* &c. Obſerve that interpoſition, δοκειτε, *think ye*, do you not eaſily think that ſuch ſins offend God more? Now although the truly ſanctified can never fall into ſuch a condition *totally* and *finally*, yet their ſins committed wilfully againſt the Goſpel, are *gradually*, and in ſome meaſure of ſuch a nature, and therefore they fall terribly into the hands of the living God, when they ſo ſinne againſt him: and conſider how that the Apoſtle ſpeaks theſe things, even to them, of whom he *hoped better things, and things that accompany ſalvation*, Heb. 6. If therefore we ſee a godly man, who hath taſted much of Gods favour, play the Prodigal, walk looſly, we may and ought (notwithſtanding Antinomian poſitions) powerfully and ſeverely ſet home theſe places of Scripture upon his conſcience. And obſerve how in the New Teſtament, the Apoſtle alledgeth two places out of the Old, *Vengeance belongeth to me*, Deut 32.35. and *the Lord will judge his people*, Pſal. 135.14. To judge is to avenge; ſo that the people of God have thoſe conſiderations in their ſins to provoke God, which wicked men cannot have; and therefore have the ſame motives to humble them; as the Apoſtle argueth, *To which of the Angels ſaid he, Sit at my right hand?* &c. So may we, To what wicked man hath God poured out his love, revealed himſelf kindly, as unto the godly? therefore do they neglect the greater mercies.

LECT.

Lect. X.

How Gods anger manifeſts it ſelf upon his own Children ſinning.

Jerem. 50. 20.

In thoſe daies, and at that time the iniquity of Judah ſhall be ſought for, &c.

In temporals. 1. By involving them in common and ordinary afflictions

Let us in the next place conſider the particulars wherein Gods *eye of anger* doth manifeſt it ſelf upon *his own children*, if *ſinning* againſt him. The effect of his *wrath* may be conſidered in that which is *temporall*, or *ſpirituall*, or *eternall*; in all theſe Gods anger doth bring forth in one reſpect or other. For the *temporall objects*, take notice of theſe particulars; firſt, *When they ſin againſt God, they are involved in the common and ordinary afflictions, which do uſually accompany ſin in the wicked:* Thus 1 *Cor.* 11.30. for their unworthy receiving of the Sacrament, (and ſome even of thoſe were godly, as appeareth, *v.* 32.) *many were weak and ſickly:* weak, were ſuch as did languiſh; and ſickly is more, ſuch as had diſeaſes on them; now theſe were πληγαὶ, ſtrokes from God, and therefore came from his *anger for their ſins.* Though the Lords Supper conſiſt of a twofold bread, the one earthly for the body, the other heavenly, the bread of life for the ſoul, yet both body and ſoul did miſerably decay, becauſe of unworthy receiving; This Table being as *Chryſoſtom* ſaid, *menſa Aquilarum*, not *Graculorum*, food for Eagles, not Jaies. As therefore thoſe children, who have fainting diſeaſes upon them, and do ſecretly eat ſalt, oatmeal, *&c.*

though they have never such excellent food at their Fathers Table, yet thrive not, but look pale, and consuming; so it was with the *Corinthians* by reason of their corruptions, they inclined to death, though they fed on the bread of life. Now that these bodily diseases are the common issue and fruit of sin appeareth, *Levit.* 26. 16. *Deut.*28.22. The grace therefore of Justification can give no Supersedeas to any disease that shall arrest a believer offending; but are the wicked in Consumptions, Agues, Feavers for their sins? So are the godly; yea, the people of God are in these calamities before the wicked, *Amos* 3.2. *You only have I known of all the Families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities.* I have *known* you, that is, acknowledged you for mine, see what that is, *Exod.*19.5. *A peculiar treasure unto me above all people:* The Hebrew word signifieth that which is dear and pretious, and to be desired of all. This is aggravated by what followeth, *for all the earth is mine*; that is, seeing there are so many Nations in the world, over whom I have full power and dominion; how great is Gods goodness in taking you for his above others? now mark the Prophets reason, because I have done this, *therefore I will visit you for your iniquities*, for to all your other wickednesses you adde an ingratefull heart. So there is another place, 1 *Pet.* 4. 17. where God is said to judge them before others, and this hath been a great offence to the godly: *It is time*, that is, a seasonable opportunity by the decree and appointment of God; *for judgement*, that is, chastisements for former sinnes, which are called judgements, because they are publique testimonies and manifestations of Gods anger against sinnes, and are to put the godly in minde of their sinnes, (only it is κρίμα, not κατακρίμα in the originall.) The word is used even of the godly, 1 *Cor.*11.31,32. 1 *Pet.*4.6. By the *house of God* he meaneth the *true Members of the Church*, and whereas he saith *it begins in them*, he thereby intimates, that the godly in this life are more exposed to afflictions for sinne, then the wicked are, and this made *David* and *Jeremy* so expostulate with *God* in this matter, so that the godly in their afflictions ought to say, as that widow of *Sarepta*, 2 King.17.18. *This is to call my sinne to remembrance.*

It

It is thought the Apostle, though he doth not expresly mention a place, yet he takes this out of the Doctrine of the Old Testament, for so *God* did begin first with his people, *Isa.* 10. 12. *Jer.* 25. 17,18. *Ezek.* 9. 6. *Begin at my Sanctuary*, Ezek. 21. 4. There God in publique calamities maketh no difference between the righteous and the ungodly; now this is so great, that the Apostle saith, the *righteous is hardly saved:* The word μόλις is used of those things that with much labour are brought about, *Acts* 14. 18. *Acts* 27. 7. These tribulations are so great, that they almost destroy the godly themselves: See also *James* 5. 13. *Is any sick?* where the godly man is supposed to be sick, and the cause, *(if he hath committed sinne)* that is, such sinnes as were the causes of that disease, *they shall be forgiven him:* So that even justified persons afflicted by diseases, are to inquire what sinnes the Lord would humble them for, and to labour that the sickness of the body, be the sanctified occasion of the health of the soul.

2. In bringing extraordinary and unusuall calamities.

2. *Gods anger is seen in bringing extraordinary and unusuall calamities upon them because of their sinnes*; so that they have strange punishments, which even the wicked do many times escape: *Jonah* who endeavoured to fly from Gods face (and that he might easily have done by Antinomian Doctrine) with what a prodigious judgement was he overtaken? *Jonah* 2. The Prophet cals it *the belly of hell:* and how deeply his soul was afflicted under that punishment appeareth, in that he saith, *his soul fainted within him*, and he concluded, *he was cast out of Gods sight.*

He that voluntarily ranne from Gods presence, doth now bewail that he is cast from it. He makes the Whales belly an house of prayer, and this came up to God, in his holy Temple, that is, heaven. You see by this, that God prepareth strange judgements sometimes for those that offend him, though his children: so in that 1 *Cor.* 11.30. when he saith, that many of the Corinthians were dead for their unworthy receiving, it is to be understood of an immature and untimely death, they did not live out to the term of those dayes, that according to naturall causes they might have done, so

that its the same with being [*cut off*] in the Old Testament, *Exod.* 12. 15. Whosoever did eat the Passeover with leaven was to be *cut off from Israel*: Therefore even godly men may procure to themselves untimely deaths, and may provoke God to cut them off in the midst of their years.

3. By striking with sudden death.

3. Yea further, God may not only afflict them in an extraordinary manner, but even *strike them with sudden death, and that while their sinnes are upon them.* I will not instance in *Ananias* and *Saphira*, nor in *Nadab* and *Abihu*, though some have thought charitably of them; we have a clear instance in *Uzzah*, wherein Gods anger was so apparent, by striking him suddenly dead, that the thing is said to displease *David*, 2 *Sam.*6.7. *The anger of God was kindled against Uzzah, and he smote him for his errours.* His errour was not, because he was not a Levite, for its plain he was; but because they put the Ark upon a new Cart, whereas they should have carried it upon their shoulders: Although its thought the carrying of the Ark was limited only to the Levites that were the sonnes of *Kohath*, and that no other Levite might touch the Ark, which if so, then it was a second offence against the Law, because he touched it; and indeed this seemeth to be the proper cause, because it was a personall fault of *Uzzah*, whereas the putting of it on a new Cart, was the errour of others besides him.

Thus *Uzzah* in his very sinnes is stricken dead; you have likewise another sad example of *Eli*, *Lege historiam, ne fias historia*, 1 Sam. 4. 18. Because he failed in the measure of zeal about the reproof of his sons, therefore *he fell backward, and broke his neck*: *Eli* manifested his pious affections, in submitting to the hand of God punishing, and in being more affected with the publique calamity then his own private, yet this is his sad Tragicall end.

4. Gods anger reaches to their children, and what is dear to them.

4. *Gods anger doth not limit it self to them only, but it reacheth even to their children, and to those that are dear to them.* Thus *Davids* childe is stricken dead, for his sinne; and thus *Elies* daughter gives up the ghost with sad grief. The family both of *David* and *Eli*, have remarkable calamities following them, and

and all becauſe of their ſinnes. When any of *Eli*'s poſterity ſhall be forced to crotch for a morſell of bread, this is a *memento* of *Eli*'s ſin.

Here a man may ſee the ſeed of the righteous begging bread, but for their Parents ſinnes; Therefore that of *David*, *Pſal.*36. muſt not be underſtood univerſally. That this calamity may the more wound his heart, God telleth him what he will do to his houſe after his death; if any were left alive, it ſhould be like that indulgence to *Cain*, to carry up and down a token of Gods diſpleaſure; and if you ask for how long ſhould this anger of God indure, 1 *Sam.*3.14. *His iniquity muſt not be purged away from that houſe for ever.* Well may the Scripture ſay, that whoſoever heareth this judgement of God, *his ears ſhall tingle.* By this inſtance, how watchfull ſhould godly parents be, leſt for their ſinnes committed, a curſe ſhould cleave to the family for many generations? I acknowledge theſe calamities as they fell upon *Eli* a godly man, ſo they were wholſom medicines, and fatherly corrections, but as they came on his wicked children or poſterity continuing in wickedneſs, ſo they were ſtrictly and properly puniſhments.

Laſtly, *Theſe temporall evils will reach even to the publique Church, and State wherein they live,* ſo that the ſinnes of godly men, may help to pull down publique judgements. Thus it was with *Hezekiah*, for his unthankfulneſs and pride there was wrath upon *Judah* and *Jeruſalem*, 2 Chron.32.25. So *Davids* ſinne in numbring the people, it was the death of many thouſand in *Iſrael*: for *Eli*'s ſinne, the Iſraelites are ſlain in the Army, and the Ark is taken. Hence you have *Eſay*, *Daniel* and *Ezra*, joyning themſelves in the number with others, who made publike confeſſion of their ſinnes upon daies of humiliation. It is therefore a curſed and ſecure opinion, that ſaith, *The godly when they keep Faſt-daies, do it not becauſe they have any ſinnes that God puniſheth, but becauſe of wicked men.* The Scripture doth manifeſt the contrary, and the holieſt men living do bring ſome ſparks and fire-brands to increaſe the wrath of God, and therefore they ought to bring their buckets for the quenching of it.

5. Theſe temporall evils will reach to the publique Church and State wherein they live.

The aggravation of this anger will appear, if you consider what kinde of sinnes they have been for which God hath been so sore displeased, and in them enumerated, or instanced in, you may perceive they were the Belzebub-sinnes, the First-born of iniquities: *Uzzah* failed only in the order God had appointed, what he did was out of care and a good intention; yet the Lord smiteth him; so *Moses* was denied entring into the Land of *Canaan*, which was an heavy affliction to him, because he spake unadvisedly with his lips: Commentators are at a loss to finde out what his sinne was. So *Davids* sinne in numbring the people, its disputed wherein the transgression lay. *Elies* heavy judgements that came so frequently one upon another, were for a want of that measure of zeal which should have burnt within him. Oh therefore consider that God doth not only see sinnes, that are mountains, but that are mole-hils comparatively! He doth not only see the beams, but the motes that are in us; he doth not only take notice of our mire and vomit, if we return to that, but of the least spot and wrinkle; how deeply mayst thou humble thy self under every Religious duty performed by thee! How often dowe fail in the manner of a command, as *Uzzah* in the order? How often out of pride and self-confidence do we number our earthly props and refuges, relying upon them? How unadvised are our thoughts and words? now these hairs of sinnes (as I may so call them, both for number and seeming littlenes) are all numbred before God.

God is angry at the least sins

As the Lord is *angry* with these *lesser sinnes* and *defects in graces*; so also for *Errours in judgements*, and *false opinions*: How well would it be for the *Antinomian*, if God did not *see this sinne* in them, that they hold, *he seeth no sinne in Believers*? I fear me *God seeth* and *taketh notice* of their erroneous *Sermons*, of their corrupt *Doctrines*, and seducing Books. There are indeed those, who would make *Heresie*, almost *innocency*, and that it is more to be pitied then punished; but the Apostle, *Gal.* 5. reckons Heresies among gross sinnes, such as exclude from the *Kingdom of heaven*; and how severe *Gods anger* is to those who do erre, though in less matters, and although they keep the foundation, appeareth in that notable place, 1 *Cor.* 3. 12, 13, 14, 15.

God angry at errors in judgements and false opinions.

It

It is a difficult place, and those that would build Purgatory out of it, they are the Architects of that *hay* and *stubble* the Text speaks of. Not to joyn with that exposition of some, who by *hay* and *stubble*, do understand evil works; nor with *Beza*, who denyeth it to be meant of false Doctrine, but only of the manner of preaching: He makes the building of *gold* and *silver*, &c. to be the *pure* and *sincere doctrine of Christ*; The *hay* and *stubble* to be the *vain affecting of eloquence and words*; but I rather go along with those that interpret the place of false Doctrines, but not such as do overthrow the foundation; only they build superfluous and unsound doctrine, upon the true Foundation, which is as uncomely, as if you should see a Royall Palace, which hath Gold for the Foundation, and Precious Stones for the Wals, yet have the covering of straw and stubble; what deformity would this be? yet so it is with the best Preachers that are, who yet adde some errours to the sound Doctrine they deliver. Now for the opening of the place, it is wholly Allegoricall; The Preachers of Gods Word are builders, and they are to raise up a stately Palace; the materials are compared to *Gold* and *Silver*, to precious Stones. The place is an allusion to *Isai.* 54.12. *I will make thy windows of Agates, and thy gates of Carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant Stones*; It is a description of the precious Graces and Doctrines, which the Ministers of God are cloathed with; and this sheweth with what esteem and high price all the Truths of Christ ought to be received by you. The Ark, *Exod* 25. 3,4,5,6. was to be made of Gold, Silver, and other Pretious materials; this is the nature of *true Doctrine*. Now *false doctrine*, though it be not in *Fundamentalls*, but in meer *accessories*, is called *hay* and *stubble*, and he that preacheth these shall come to a severe triall. *Every mans work*, saith the Text, *shall be made manifest*; where you see the spreading of false Doctrine is called the work of a man, as in the second Epistle of *John* it's called *evil deeds*; and this evil work hath a two-fold effect; First, It makes the owner to *suffer loss*, that is, all that labour and pains he hath taken shall bring him no profit; whereas, if he had imployed himself in the Truth, his reward would have been great. The *lucrum cessans* is as great

great a loss as the *damnum emergens*. Oh, what a fearfull thing will it be for false teachers, who have made it their whole business to spread new opinions, to lose all their labour! The other effect is, that *though he be saved, yet it shall be so as by fire*; that is, he shall be in extream danger, and he shall have sad tribulations and miseries falling upon him; see the like phrase, *Jude v.23. pulling them out of the fire.* That which thou comfortest thy self with, and glorie'st in, as if it were persecution, it may be is nothing but part of the fire in the Text, which is to afflict thee, that thy dross may be purged out: Let therefore all false teachers (though belonging to God) expect a fire of burning, great afflictions and tribulations. And if Antinomians have trouble for their doctrine, they are bound to believe God chastiseth them for this very opinion, *that he doth not chastise for sinne.* I have been the longer on this place, because of the multitude of *hay* and *stubble* that is built every where. God will have his day, when a fire shall rise to consume it all, and the true Doctrine will only continue. The Apostle speaks as terribly afterwards, *vers.17. If any man defile the Temple of God, him shall God destroy:* where the Apostle calleth the Corinthians the *Temple of God:* now this is not so much true of every single Christian, as when collected together in a Church or body; and the Spirit dwelling among them, is much more admirable then his presence in the Ark; and he defileth this Temple, who by any *false Doctrine*, and error, corrupts that society; now the greatness of this sinne is seen by the words following, the Lord will *destroy him*, for so φθερεῖ is the same with ἀπολέσει, so that as God destroyed *Athaliah* and *Belteshazzar* for prophaning the Temple and the offerings or gifts of the Temple, no less punishment (unless they repent) shall fall upon those who pervert the Doctrines of Christ.

Manifestation of Gods anger to believers sinning in spirituall and internall things. 1. In matter of consolation.

I come to the second demonstration of Gods *anger to believers when sinning*, and that is in *spirituall* and *internall things:* now they are of two sorts; First, The *consolations of the holy Ghost*, with the *light of Gods favour:* Secondly, The *flourishing* and *sprouting of the graces of sanctification*; in both these you shall finde the godly man after sinne much withered.

What

What anger in the first sense, after sinne, the godly may feel, *David* will abundantly tell you, *Psal.* 11. he cals it the *breaking of his bones*; you know how terrible and grievous that is, and in the godly this must be the more terrible, because they are of a more tender apprehension: As they say, Christs bodily pain was more then other mens could be, because of the excellent temper and tender constitution of his body; so it is with the godly, every expression of Gods anger, fals like a drop of scalding lead into a mans eye: The conscience of the Believer, when once awakened, feels every frown of God like an hell. Thus after the committing of gross sinne, God hides his face, and then for the while, they are like so many *Cains* and *Judas's*, crying out their *sinne is greater then they can bear*; and truly this worm would never die, this fire would never be quenched in them, did not God again take them into favour: Here is no difference between a man damned in hell, and a godly man troubled in conscience, but the adjunct of time, one is perpetuall, and the other is not. Now our Divines say, that eternity is not essentiall to the punishment of hell, (for Christ suffered the torments of hell for us, which yet were not in time eternall) but accidentall, because those in hell are not able to satisfie Gods justice, therefore they must continue there till they have paid the last farthing, which because they cannot do to all eternity, therefore they are tormented for ever. Look upon *David* again, in *Psal.* 32.3,4. how it fared with him, because of his sinnes; *My bones waxed old, through my roaring all the day long, my moisture is turned into the drought of Summer*: Did *David* speak these things Hyperbolically, and Rhetorically only? Did he not finde such anguish and consumption in his soul, that he thought no words could express it? and all this he saith was because of sinne: Oh then believe this and tremble, lest such a Whale of sorrow and grief should swallow thee up, as did *David*. Thus it was also with the incestuous person, the devil was ready to *swallow him up*; he was delivered to him to be tormented by him; and can all this be done, yet God *take no notice* of sinne? As the godly in this life time, may have that joy in the Gospel, which *passeth all understanding*, and more

then the heart can perceive; so they may have for sinne such trouble, and spirituall desertions, that shall make every thing, their chamber, the field a very hell to them; and *David* in many *Psalms* manifesteth such desolation upon his soul; especially this is seen in lapses, when persecutions do abound, and men through fear, have denied that Truth which in their consciences they were assured of. We may reade in Ecclesiasticall Histories of the grievous wounds and gashes Gods people through frailty have made upon their own souls. And as it is thus in *matter of consolation*, so in the particular of *sanctification*, how may you observe some, who have been planted by Gods grace like a Paradise, through their negligence and corruptions become like a parched wilderness? Was not *David* in his fall, till recovered, like a Tree in Winter? though the moisture of grace was within, yet nothing did outwardly appear; Was he not like *Sampson* when his hair was cut off, not able to break the cords of sinne he was tied in? some have thought a godly man can no more fall from the degrees of grace, then the essence and State of grace; but if sinne increase and grow, certainly grace must decrease, for whether sinne expell grace meritoriously only, or formally, still the introduction of the one must be the expulsion of the other. Thus *Revel.* 2. the Church is reproved for *abating in her first love*; and the people of God complain, *Why hast thou hardened our hearts from thy fear?* Isa.63.17. not that God doth infuse hardness, but only he denieth mollifying grace. And certainly a gracious tender heart, must fear a deliverance up to hardness more then up to Satan. *Illud est cor durum, quod non trepidat ad nomen cordis duri*, saith *Bernard*; That is an hard heart which doth not tremble at the name of an hard heart. A godly man therefore may so provoke God, that he be left in a senseless, stupid way, acting sin without tender remorse, and securely lying down therein.

2. In sanctification.

The manifestation of Gods anger Eternall.

Lastly, *The anger of God eternall cannot indeed be in the event upon him, but yet it doth conditionally oblige him till he doth repent*; so that you may suppose a Believer to be damned, if you suppose him not to repent. A conditionall Proposition, *Nihil ponit in esse*, but it doth *in posse*; and therefore the Scripture

makes

makes such Hypotheticall Propositions, wherein a possibility of Apostacy is supposed in the godly, if left to themselves, as in that famous place, *Ezek.* 18.14. *When the righteous man turneth away from his righteousnes, and comitteth iniquity, all his righteousnes shall not be mentioned, in his sinnes he shall die.* This place is not (as some do) to be understood of a righteous man in *appearance* only, for its opposed to a wicked man in *reality*; and it is such a righteousnes, that if continued in, he should have lived eternally. Neither may we stretch it to an apostacy from the state of Justification, as others do; but its to be understood as comminatory, by way of threatning and supposition: for its true, that if a godly man should forsake his righteousnes, it would not be remembred to him; and therefore if you suppose a justified person not to repent of his grievous sinnes committed, you may also suppose him to die in the displeasure and eternall *wrath of God*, but this is more exactly to be considered of, when we handle that question, Whether Remission of sinne obtained, may be frustrated and made void by new subsequent actuall sinnes.

Lect. XI.

The Antinomians Distinction of Gods Knowing and Seeing Sinne, examined.

Heb. 4. 13.

Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.

Although this Text in the general sense of it, will not fully prove *Gods eye of anger against sin in justified persons*; yet because a more special scrutiny, and search into the words, will make much against the Antinomian Errour, and also because the Answers which are given to this Text, and the like, do contain gross falshoods; so that in the refuting of them, all things in this Controversie will be clearly discovered; as also because that principal and noble Question, *How far Gods taking notice of sinne, to chastise and punish it, is subject to the meer liberty of his will?* will in some measure be discussed; I shall therefore insist upon this Text. Not that the Orthodox make it their shield of *Achilles*, as the Antinomian slandereth, *Hony Comb*, pag. 73. But because the vanity of that distinction, which they make between Gods *Seeing*, and his *Knowing*, may be brought out from behinde the stuff, where like *Saul* it had hid it self.

The Coherence.

And first, for the Text absolutely in it self, The words are part

part of that excellent *commendation*, which is given to *Gods Word*. The purity and power of Religion is kept up by acknowledging the fulneſſe and perfection of the Scripture. Both Papiſts and Illuminatiſts agree in this dangerous Errour, That they look for and expect a Doctrinal Teaching immediately by Gods Spirit, above and beſides that of the Word: Hence as the Papiſts make the Scripture but a ſheath to receive any Sword, either of Gold or Iron (words that will bear any ſenſe you put upon them) ſo do the Illuminatiſts, That a godly man is above all Books, Teachers, Writings, and feels nothing but God working and acting in him. We have therefore the greater cauſe to ſet up the Scriptures in their Divine Authority and fulneſſe, by how much the more others endeavour to diminiſh it. This noble *Encomium* of *Gods Word* beginneth *verſ.* 12. where you have the *Subject* of the Commendation, and the *Commendation* it ſelf. The *Subject* is called ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, *The Word of God*. *Bellarmine* and other Papiſts, that they might depreſſe the Authority of the Sriptures, underſtand this of *Chriſt*, who is often called the *Word*. Their reaſons are partly becauſe Chriſt is in other places called ſo, as *John* 1.1. *& alibi*, and partly becauſe this *Word* is ſpoken of as a *Perſon*, and therefore all things are ſaid to be *open and naked to his ſight*. But theſe are not cogent; for although in other places *Chriſt* is called the *Word*, yet the Context doth there clearly evince it, whereas here the contrary will appear: for having before exhorted them to receive the Goſpel, and to hearken to the voice, while it cals to day, among other Arguments, he brings this from the Nature of Gods Word, which is to be underſtood both of the Law and the Goſpel; and its further obſerved as a peculiar thing to *John* onely in his Goſpel, and the Epiſtles, to call *Chriſt* the *Word of God*; and although the Text ſpeaks of the Word of God as preached, and not as written, yet becauſe the Word written and preached, differ not eſſentially but accidentally in reſpect of the manner, therefore this Argument holds true of the Scriptures. As for the ſecond reaſon, It is ordinary by a Metonymy to attribute that to the *Scripture* which belongs to *God ſpeaking by the Scripture*, as *Gal.* 3. 22. *The Scripture hath concluded all under*

sinne, &c. So the *Scripture* is said *to speak*, Jam. 4. 5. So that it is no wonder if here *the word of God be spoken of*, as knowing all things, because God by this doth discover and manifest every thing. In the next place, consider the *Commendation*, and that is, First, From the *Adjunct Qualities*. Secondly, From the *Powerfull Effects*. The Adjunct Qualities are [*Quick and Powerfull*] that is, it is not dead or frustrated, but puts forth its power and efficacy, which our words cannot do. It is thought to be an allusive expression to the fire which was on the Altar of Sacrifices, that was not to go out.

Secondly, Its commended from the *Effect*, its *sharper then a two-edged Sword*; its an *Hebraism*, to give a mouth to the sword, because it doth so devour; but because a two-edged, or two-mouthed sword doth divide more forcibly, therefore is Gods Word compared to that. Such a sword, they say, the Levites in the Old Testament did use in dividing and opening the Sacrifices, in which Metaphor the Apostle continueth afterwards. Now by this comparison two things are insinuated,

1. *That God knoweth all sin even the most hidden.*

2. *This knowledge is not a meer bare knowledge, but such as is of a Judge examining and punishing.* For as the sword doth pierce and hurt, so Gods Word doth see and punish, therefore it is said to be κριτικὸς, that is, most exactly discerning and separating gold from drosse, and judging accordingly: So that the Text speaking not barely of an *Omniscient eye of God*, but an *eye*, *discerning*, *judging* and *punishing*, doth in this consideration pertinently belong to the Controversie.

We need not be curious in distinguishing between the *Spirit* and the *Soul* (only the Scripture doth not confound these together) nor between the things understood by the *Marrow* and *Joynts*, which are translated from the body to the soul.

The Text opened.

This is intended in the General; by the *Joynts*, he means the *minima*, the *least things*; and by the *marrow*, the *intima*, the *most secret and inward things*.

Having thus described the *efficacy of Gods Word*, he layeth down two Propositions in my Text: one Negative, the other Affirmative.

Affirmative. Negative, *There is no creature,* ἀφανὴς, *inapparent, but he seeth through it.* Affirmative, *All things are naked and opened*; opened is more then naked; *Naked* is that which is *not cloathed,* or *covered*; *Opened* is that, *whose inwards are discovered, and made conspicuous.* Much is said by Criticks concerning the word τετραχηλισμένα *Cameron* thinks it translated from wrastlers, who are said, τραχηλίζειν, their adversary, when they so take him by the neck, and turn him upside down, so as to object him in every part to the eyes of the beholders: Some say, the Metaphor may be taken from those, who being before the Judge, hold down their neck and face to the ground, as not daring to behold his face: But that which is most received, and which is most consonant to the Context, is of those who take the word from those who begin at the neck, and divide the Sacrifice in the middle, so that all the inwards do appear.

Thus you see how emphatical and full the Scripture is in describing of Gods *omniscient Eye of any sinne, wheresoever it is*; and that not by a *meer bare cognition,* but of *Judging*: So that the Observation is,

That seeing there is sin in Justified persons, Gods eye must needs see it and judge it. *Observ.*

To this it is answered very confidently by a distinction never heard of before, that God indeed *knoweth* the sins of believers, but he doth not *see* them, *Honey-comb,* p. 67, 68, 69, 70. and this distinction they plead so boldly for, that (they say) although all men, Devils and Angels, would gainsay it, yet it must stand. For the opening of this silly distinction, they express themselves thus. That although to *see* and *know* be all one in the pure uncompounded *Nature of God,* yet they are not so to *us*; even as Justice and Mercy are all one in God, but not to us, yea contrary; and the Author giveth two strong Reasons (as he cals them) to prove this; First, *The Scripture* (saith he) *distinguisheth them*; Now he argueth, That as it is a sinne to distinguish where the Scripture doth not (and thereupon he instanceth in the distinction of the *guilt of sinne,* and the *nature of sinne,* making it a new distinction, and suspecting it for a corrupter of the Gospel, as if Christ had taken away the *guilt* of

Antinomians answer by distinguishing.

of our sins, and not the *sins themselves*) so where the Scripture doth distinguish, there it is a sinne for us to distinguish. Now concerning the former, that there is in the Scripture a distinction between the *guilt of sin*, and *sin its self*, is in its due time to be proved.

Let us consider, how he proveth this distinction of Gods *seeing* and *knowing*. The place he brings, is *Psal.*94.9,10. *He that formed the eye, shall not he see? He that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?* Here (saith he) they are distinctly set down, and the Scripture useth this continual practice, saying no where, *That God doth not know the sins of Justified persons*, but in many places, *That he seeth no sinne in them*. His second Reason is, Because among men and Angels, yea in God himself there is a Reason (to our capacities) of this difference, for to *know a thing*, is, *to understand the nature of it*, though *the thing it self be abolished*, and hath *no existence*; but to *see a thing*, is *to have a reall existence of it before our eye*. As for instance, God (saith he) knoweth the flood that drowned the whole world, but he doth not see it, having an existence now; So God knoweth the leprosie of *Naaman* more perfectly then *Naaman* did himself, yet he doth not see it upon *Naaman*; and thus God *knoweth* the *sins* of the *wicked*, and of his *Justified children* more perfectly then they themselves do, and herein is no difference between them; but here is the difference, *That God seeth sin in the one, and not in the other*, because abolished by Christ.

Thus you have a heap of falshoods, and *non*-sense together, as if the Author had no knowing, or seeing, while he speaks of these things.

To let you understand the truth in these particulars; howsoever it would be very profitable in this place, to give you the Scripture-Doctrine about the *Eye*, or *seeing of God*; as also the different use of it in Scripture; namely, that sometimes its taken for a *meer naked apprehension* of a thing; sometimes for the *actions or effects that do flow from Gods seeing*, and then it is used either in a *good sense* for the *eye of his care, protection*, and *approbation*; or in a *bad sense*, and that two wayes; either for an *eye of condemnation*, in which sense *God doth not see the sins of believers*,

believers, or of *displeasure* and *anger*, in which sense its expressly said, *The sinfull actions of godly men are evil in Gods eyes.* However, I say, it would be very profitable to speak of this here, yet I shall put it off.

The truth of the Antinomian distinction examined by several Propositions.

I shall therefore examine what truth is in this Distinction, which they so applaud, and that shall be by several Propositions.

1. *That seeing is attributed to God only metaphorically*, God hath no bodily eyes. It is well observed by a Father, That the meaner and more debased the things are to which God is compared, there is the least danger, because every common apprehension will judge it not to be truly, and formally so in God. And thus it is of *Eyes*, and when to *see* is attributed to God, it is the same thing with to *know*, so that to make a difference between these two, is grosse ignorance.

1. Seeing attributed to God only metaphorically.

2. *Knowledge* is attributed likewise to *God*, but in a far different sense from what it is in us, and therefore differs from our knowledge many wayes: 1. *His knowledge is his substance:* Hence *Synesius* said God to be σοφὸς, by his understanding. 2. *Its not caused from objects.* *Gregory* expressed it well, *Ipse mundus nobis non notus esse posset, nisi esset, Deo autem nisi notus esset esse non posset.* 3. *Its simple and one.* There is properly no memory of things past, no prescience of things to come, but all things are present to him; As if there were a body that were all eyes, that needed not to turn it self backward and forward, to see things; or as a man standing upon an high Tower, doth with one cast of his eye, behold passengers at the bottom of the Tower, which go successively one after another; Thus *Deus est totus lux, & totus oculus*, God is altogether light, and wholly an eye. 4 *Knowledge in us*, is properly taken for to *know a thing by its causes*, but it is not so in God. This rightly understood will overthrow that distinction of *knowing and seeing.*

2. Gods knowledge and ours differs.

3. *That Text*, Psal. 94. *doth no wayes suppose such a distinction*; For the *Psalmist* doth there intend, whatsoever *perfection* is either in *bodily seeing*, or *mental knowing*, it is *eminently* and more *transcendently in God*; neither doth he limit *seeing* to the *sins of wicked men*, and *knowing* only to the *sins of the godly*; yea, the

3 The alledged Text, Psal. 94. no ground for their distinction.

Text maketh thus against the Antinomian, *If a believer himself, and others see sinne in him, shall not God much more?* Indeed in the *Creatures*, there is a distinction between *seeing* and *knowing* in some respects; for *knowing* may be of a thing in the abstract, but *seeing* doth denote the *intuitive present apprehension*, so that *knowing* hath a *perfection*, which *seeing* hath not, and *seeing* which *knowing* hath not: but in God all his *knowledge is intuitive*, and all things are *present* to him, because of his eternity and omnipresence: so the Schools determine, and rightly, upon that Text 2 *Pet.* 3. afterwards to be explained, and the reason is, because *intuitive knowledge*, or the apprehension of a thing present, is the most noble knowledge, not that the things themselves do co-exist, or are present to one another, but unto God in Eternity; for as Gods immensity is in respect of his Essence, so his Eternity is in regard of time: so that although the things themselves vary, yet Gods knowledge doth not; As an Artificer, who hath the *Idea*, or form of an house in his minde before he makes it; when it is made, and after it is destroyed, he hath still the same form in his minde, though the house be altered.

4. The Scripture useth no such difference.

4. *Neither doth the Scripture customarily use such a difference*; yea, to *know*, when attributed to God, is used many times for a *knowledge of approbation*, and then we cannot say, God *knoweth the sins of believers*, but we may as well say, God *knoweth* no sin in them, that is, to *condemn* them for it, as well as he *seeth* none in them, so *Hab.* 1. God is said to be of *purer eyes then to behold iniquity*, that is, with *approbation*; and so in this sense we may say, *God seeth no sin, no not in wicked men.* Besides, it is very false, that the Scripture doth no where say, *that he seeth sin in believers*; for it is expresly said of *Davids numbring the people*, and of his *murder*, that it was *evil* in Gods eyes, and he confesses that he had *done that evil in Gods sight.* But of this more hereafter.

So then wherefoever the Scripture saith, God *seeth no sinne*, there we may also as truly say, God *knoweth none*; and where it is said, he doth *see*, there we may say, he doth *know* also.

5. There is no distinction to

5. *There is in reason, no distinction to be made to our capacities between*

between Gods knowing and seeing; for in those instances the Author giveth, we may say, God *knoweth* in that respect as he *seeth*, and he doth *not see* in that respect he doth *not know*: As for example, God doth not *see* the flood now to be, no more can we say he *knoweth* it now to be, for that is false; God doth not *see* the leprosie upon *Naaman*, no more doth he *know* it to be on him: So God *knoweth* his people in Christ, as well as *seeth* them in Christ; and therefore if by Christ *he seeth no sinne in them*, he must likewise *know none in them*. Now this Error is grounded upon a dangerous conceit, as if Gods *seeing* were limited to *things existent*, and his *knowledge* to *things past* or *future*, so that its inexcusable ignorance, to say with this Author, that God *knew* the Sun and Moon before he made them, but he did not *see* them. He did not indeed *see* them to be before they were, no more did he *know* them to be before they were; but when they were made, his *seeing* and *knowing* of them were all one.

our capacities between Gods knowing and seeing.

6. If Gods *seeing were to be explained oppositely to his knowing, then nothing that had a present being were known by God.* But doth not the Scripture give to God the *knowledge of all things?* and though the things be diversified by time past, present, and to come, yet to God they are not so; consider that eminent place, 2 *Pet.* 3. 8. *A thousand years with God, are but as one day*. The Apostle alledgeth this place out of *Psal.* 90. 4. with a little variation. The *Psalmist* saith, *As yesterday when it is past*: The Apostle, *As one day*. The *Psalmist* saith, *In thy eyes, O Lord*: The Apostle, *with the Lord*. The *Psalmists* expression, *In the eyes of the Lord*, are very pregnant to our purpose. Here is a Description of Eternity, proving, that God *seeth all things with one intuitive cast of his eye*; and that although to us things are present, past, and to come; yet to God all things are present; and although we are not able to reach this with our understanding, no more then a pigmy the Pyramides, yet we must rest more upon this Scripture Assertion, then our understanding, *Quicquid de Deo dici* (we may adde *cogitari*) *potest, se ipso est indignum quia dici* (*cogitari*) *potest*. And again, *Digne Deum æstimamus, dum inæstimabilem dicimus*. The Schoolmen dispute, Whether those things

6. Gods seeing and knowing not opposite.

which God did *once know*, he *still knoweth*; As for example, God once knew that Christ *was to die*, but now it is not true that *he is to die*; And their resolution is, that we cannot properly say, God *begins* to *know* what he did, or *ceaseth to know* what he did; but rather that the thing it self *beginneth to be known*, or *ceaseth to be known*; so that the change is not in respect of *Gods knowing*, but the *thing known*; as when I see the Sun, and afterwards it is hid in the cloud, the change is not in mine eye, but in the Sun; Hence they also resolve, That God *knoweth all things simul together*, that his *knowledge* is *invariable*, that it admitteth not of *increase* or *decrease*, that all things are *present* to him, and that as the Sun is alwayes *in actu lucendi*, so God *in actu intelligendi*: So that this very Text doth briefly overthrow all that which the Antinomian in so many pages sweateth to prove; and that the consideration of Gods eternal *knowledge* in this manner is of profitable use, appeareth by that, when the Apostle saith, *Be not ignorant of this one thing*.

7. Gods seeing not limited to things present.

7. If Gods *seeing of things were limited in our capacity, only to things present, then all the by-past sins of ungodly men, though unrepented of, yet God doth not see them; because they have no present being*, and so God shall not only, *not see sins* in the *godly*, but likewise not in the *ungodly*: All the past sins of *Judas* and *Cain*, God did *not see* at the day of their death, for they were *past away*. Here will be much comfort to unbelievers, as well as believers.

8 Gods not seeing sins past excludes Christs merits.

8. If therefore God doth *not see a thing*, because it is *past*, what need the Antinomian run to *Christs merits taking away sinne out of Gods sight*, for this would follow by natural consequence, because the *object is taken away*? Take their own instances, God doth not now see the flood that drowned the world; The leprosie upon *Naaman*; The *Israelites* wound that is healed; why so? Doth there need the bloud of Christ to remove these? No, it followeth naturally, because the objects are removed and taken away; and so it would be here.

9 Antinomian instances contrary to their Doctrine.

9. *All these instances for Gods not seeing, yet knowing, are contrary to the Doctrine they hold.* God doth *not see* the flood that drowned the world, he *seeth not Naamans* leprosie, why so? because

because these things have *no being*; but here is their grand absurdity, that they hold *sin hath still an objective existency in us, in Gods understanding, and yet he doth not see it.* They should have instanced in some thing that hath a *being*, and yet for all that, God *not see it.* If *Naamans* leprosie had continued on him still, and yet God *not see it*, then it had been to the purpose: for they grant, that we have *truly sin in us*, and we are to judge so; yet though it hath such a *being in us*, God doth *not see it.*

10. What an empty cobweb is this distinction, even for that very purpose they bring it? Oh, say they, *If God see sin, he is of so pure a nature, that he cannot be but horribly and infinitely displeased with us. Those* (say they) *that hold God seeth sin in believers, consider not how loathsom, even the least sin is in his eyes.* But will this comfort my conscience, if they say at the same time, though God *doth not see it*, yet he *knoweth it?* Alas, God is of that pure nature, that if he *knoweth* but the *least sin* by me, he cannot but be infinitely displeased at it. So that you see this distinction will no wayes ease a believer in point of the trouble of his conscience. And thus have I laboured to break the heart of this false and ignorant distinction.

10. The vainnesse of this distinction.

LECT.

Lect. XII.

Propositions shewing how farre Gods taking notice of sinne, so as to punish it, is subject to the meer liberty of his Will.

Heb. 4. 13.

All things are naked and opened to him, &c.

2. Antinomians second answer.

THe second answer made by the Antinomians to this Argument from Gods *Omniscience* is this, For when we say, How weak and absurd is it to hold, God *doth not see that which we see?* They answer (*Honey-Comb* pag. 61.) *Here we oppose the power of God against his will, for he seeth all things, saving that which he undertakes to abolish out of his own sight, that he may not see it, so that by his mysticall clothing of us with his Sonnes righteousnes, he hath abolished it out of his own sight, though not out of ours.* Now we told you that this answer is not universally to be slighted: For our Divines, *Parens* and others, (as I mentioned before) maintaining that *remission of sinne*, though it be the *utter deletion of the guilt*, yet not the *full eradication and abolition of the filth*, but that it still continueth in us; make this objection to themselves, *Nothing is hid or covered from Gods eyes: if therefore sinne be there, he cannot but see it:* To this they answer, *God seeth all, but what he will not see*; and that is a known saying of *Austins*, *Noluit advertere, noluit animadvertere; noluit agnoscere, maluit ignoscere*, God will not take notice of the sins

of

of justified persons, he will not punish them, he had rather forgive them. It seemeth then by this, *That God will not see sinne in believers to condemnation, but yet he will to castigation*; but if Christ hath *fully satisfied Gods wrath*, and it be a *meer arbitrary* thing in God, whether he will *chastise* or no, why then should not Gods *anger* and his *chastisements* be removed from the godly by Christs death, as well as his *justice* and *punishments*? It's therefore worthy the inquiry, *How far Gods taking notice of sinne so as to chastise or punish it, is subject to the meer liberty of his Will*: And in answering of this, I will not range as far as this Question will carry me: for the totall discussion of it in its large extent, will be when we speak of the meritorious cause of Justification against Socinians. To speak therefore in a more restricted way of this matter; Consider these Propositions, some whereof are ground-works and foundations, the other more immediatly reaching to our scope in hand.

First, *There is in God a liberty and free will, whereby he doth whatsoever he pleaseth*, so that as the Psalmist saith, *He that made the eye to see, shall not he see? He that maketh man to know, shall not he know?* and thus he that gave man and Angels this perfection of freedom, shall not he much more be free? Therefore those titles of ἀυτεξούσιος and ἀυτοκράτωρ, which the Greek Fathers sometimes give to the will of man, are too proud and lofty, and do more properly belong to God. Indeed so farre as *freedom* is conceived in *creaturs* to have some *potentiall* ἀδιαφορίαν indifferency, or τὸ ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροις, a *suspendednes to be determinated by some other*, so farre we are not to conceive it in God; for this *mutability* or Potentiall *indetermination*, is an *imperfection*; and so that same *potestas peccandi*, power to sinne, which some make *necessary to liberty*, and which they call a *perfection*, though they grant the *action of sin it self* to be an *imperfection*, (though this should be granted, which must not) yet neither could this be found in *Gods liberty*: and no marvell, seeing that it is not in the *liberty* of Christs *humane will*, for though Christs obedience was truly and properly so, being under a command of God, yet not only as he was *God*, but as he was *man*, he was ἀπεκκλιτος, and ἀναμάρτητος *impeccable, or free from the temptation of sin*. Therefore it's detestable blasphemy of *Durand*, and other Schoolmen, saying

1. There is in God a liberty whereby he doth whatsoever he pleaseth.

ing, *Christ might have sinned*, lib. 3 *Sentent. dist.* 12. *qua.* 2. as also of the Remonstrants, who say, *Christ after he had taken this Office of a Mediatorship, might have forsaken it, and given it over*, but of this more in its proper place; God therefore is a *free agent*, Psal. 135, 6. *He hath done whatsoever he pleased in heaven and earth*; so that he made not the world as the fire burneth, or the Bees make their Honey-Combs, by a *naturall necessity*, but according to the *councell of his will*; hence it is that all his spiritual mercies become commended unto us, under the title of grace: There was no naturall or morall necessity, obliging God to elect us, to give his Sonne for us, or to save us: and indeed it could not be liberality, if it were not *a libero*, from one that is free.

2. How freedom may be extended to God.

Propos. 2. *According to the different descriptions of liberty and freedom; so it may be extended larger, or narrower unto the actions of God.* Those who make *liberty consistent with a necessity of immutability*, and do not think *indifferency necessary*, but only *knowledge* and *judgement going before*, they extend it even to the *goodness* and *holiness* of God; so they say, God is *liberè bonus*, *freely good*, and doth *freely love* himself; so they make the confirmed Angels and Saints, *freely to love God*, though *necessarily*; thus we sinne *freely*, though *necessarily*: But others, who make a *power to do*, or *not do*, *necessary to liberty*, think it a kinde of blasphemy to say, God doth *freely will that which is good*, hence they make *liberty* not an *attribute of his nature*, as *holiness*, *omnipotency*, &c. are, but an *affection of his Will only*, and they think that *necessarium* and *contingens*, under which *liberty* is comprehended, are *differences of* ens *in its full latitude*, as *finitum* and *infinitum*; therefore as the same thing cannot be *finite* and *infinite*, so neither *necessary* and *free*: but this is to put the definition of liberty into too strait fetters, as in time may be shewn. I joyn with those, that think *immutability* and *liberty* may be in the *same act*, and that God doth *freely*, though *unchangeably love himself*; but that *freedom of his actions to the creatures, is with a power to do otherwise if he pleaseth.*

There is also another kinde of *liberty* mentioned by the Learned, which is *opposed to servitude*, and is the same with *sui juris*; now God in all things is this way *free*: He hath no law imposed upon

upon himself by any other, but only what he prescribeth himself, that doth he work by; therefore when we say, Its just with God to damn an impenitent sinner, this justice ariseth not from any *obligation put upon him by another, but what he hath eternally prescribed himself.*

Propos. 3. *Gods omniscience, or his bare seeing and taking notice of sin, when it is, is not subject to his liberty. He cannot but see whatsoever is, and also possible to be,* so that we cannot say properly *God seeth all things because he will see them*; for this is an attribute founded in the *nature of God*; but if we take *knowledge* or *seeing* for the *effects accompanying them*, as the Scripture for the most part doth, because God is not an idle spectator of things, but upon his *seeing*, there is either *care* and *protection*, or *anger* and *punishment*, then in this sense, all these *effects* are *subject* in some sense to the liberty and *free-will of God*. God cannot but *see* the adultery of *David*, but whether he will so *see it*, as to *punish David for it* in his *own person*, or in *Christ*; or whether he will *chastise him at this time*, or *in this manner*, that is meerly at the *good pleasure* of God. Whether indeed he is *free* to *punish at all*, or *chastise at all*, you will hear in the other Propositions; thus much we may conclude, That God cannot abolish sin so out of his sight, so that with his eyes of omniscience he should not behold it, when it is there.

3. We cannot properly say God seeth all things because he will see them.

Propos. 4. *In respect of Gods liberty and freedom, there is great difference between the attributes of God, as also the exercises and actions of them.* There are some *properties* that require *no object for the exercise*, but they *make it*; thus the *omnipotency* of God doth not *finde*, but *make its object*. Again, there are others, which though they require an *object*, yet not any condition or *circumstance in it*; so the *wisdom of God* can and doth order every *object*, let it be what it will be, to a glorious end. It ordered an harmonious world out of a Chaos, he made all things, *quâ omnipotens*, as omnipotent, and ordered them all, *quâ sapiens*, as a wise God. But then there are other *attributes*, which though *essentiall* to him, yet cannot be *exercised*, but where the *objects* are *so and so conditionated*; as that *mercy* of God, whereby he doth *forgive sins*, requireth an *object penitent* and *believing*; so that *Justice* of God, whereby it is *punitive*

4. Great difference in respect of Gods freedom between the attributes of God, and the actions of them.

and *vindicative* of sinne, requireth an *object*, that is a *sinner* and *impenitent*; now in the *actions* about the *objects of the former sort* God is *every way free*, he might have *created* the world, or *not have created it*; but in the *actions* of the *later sort*, though he be also *free*, yet not so, as to use *Justice* or *not Justice*, when there is an *object*, with its *due condition*. As now it was *free* to God, whether he would *make man or no*, it was *free* for him, whether he would *permit man to fall or no*, but when *fallen*, *not free* whether he would be *just or no*: Thus God is *free*, whether he will procure, or *prepare an object of Justice*; but then when he hath so *prepared an object*, then he is not *loosened* from the *obligation of Justice*. *To procure an object of Justice* ariseth from the Soveraignty and *meer freedom* of God: Hence Gods *permission of sinne*, or *reprobation negative*, which is the passing by of some, are not *acts of Justice properly so called*; but *condemnation for sinne* is truly and *properly Justice*. The former arise from Gods supream dominion and *freedom*. When an *object of Justice is*, there is an *obligation to execute the same* upon it, but not when an *object of mercy is*, because its necessary to *mercy* that it should be *indebita*, but to *justice*, *debita*.

I do not here intend to meddle with that question, Whether God absolutely might not have let sinne go unpunished, and yet forgive it, as we see men can: (This is disputed even among the Orthodox; some are for the negative, as *Piscator*, *Lubertus*, *&c.* others for the affirmative, as *Davenant*, *Twist*, &c. but the proper place for this will be, when we speak of Christs satisfaction,) nor yet with that other of the Schoolmen, Whether God may absolutely accept of a sinner to pardon and eternall life, though he do not regenerate or sanctifie him; these are to be handled in their proper place. You see by this delivered, how farre the *actions of Gods Justice* may be said to be *free*, or *not free*.

5. God cannot in justice but punish sinners.

Propos. 5. *Whosoever may be said in an absolute sense about Gods Justice, yet since that threatning promulged,* (In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die the death) *God cannot in Justice but punish sinners.* Though it be in his *freedom* whether he will give thee a *being or no*, yet if thou art an *obstinate sinner*, it is not in his *freedom*, whether he will *damn thee or no*; so that

as

as God *cannot but love* that Image of his holiness where he *seeth it*, so he *cannot but hate* the contrary wheresoever it is, though that *hatred* shall not alwaies *fall upon the person in whom it is*, because *removed by Christ*.

It is *Camerons* opinion, that the word *justitia*, δικαιοσύνη, when *attributed to God*, doth alwaies signifie *goodness*, *mercy*, *salvation*, *redemption*, but never in the Scripture (saith he) doth it denote an *affection* in God whereby he *avengeth himself upon sinners*; but that the words *ira* and *judicium*, *anger* and *judgement* express this; But though the word signifie so sometimes, yet in some places it must needs mean this disposition in God, *Psal.*9.5. 1 *Tim.*4.8. 2 *Thes.*1.6. so that in some sense, we may with several Orthodox men say, *Justice is essential to God. Sin* is not indeed *Physically contrary* to God, as water is to fire, for if it were so, God would not *suffer it to be*, because he is an *infinite good*; as if there were infinite fire or light, there could not be any water or darkness; but it is *morally contrary to him*, Hab.1. *Thou art of purer eyes then to behold iniquity*; even *sinnes* against any *positive command* of God, that are sinnes only because prohibited, they are thus far *against his nature*, and not his *will only*; because it is against his *nature*, to have his *will* and commands *disobeyed* in any thing, he being the supream and most holy Lawgiver. If God did only *punish sinne because he will*, and not because he is *essentially just*, there could no true cause be given, why Heathens should have terrour in their consciences after sins committed, seeing the word is not revealed unto them, declaring Gods will: and when the Scripture speaks of God *punishing sins*, it doth not attribute it to Gods *meer will*, because he will do so, but to his *justice*, Rev. 16.5,7. Thus *Exod.*24. God is described by this property, *not acquitting the guilty*. Now when we say, God *cannot but punish sinne with death since the promulgation of the threatning*, that is not so to be understood, as if then only the tie and *obligation of justice came upon God*, but it was *from eternity*: for as God did *in time reveal this threatning*; so he did from all *eternity will this threatning*, and so therefore *from all eternity* it was *just with God to punish a sinner*, neither could he *forgive* him *without a satisfaction*. This is diligently to be observed, because men speak sometimes, as if *vin-*

dicative justice were then only due when the *actual threatning was*; whereas the *executions of God in time*, are, as his *decrees* were, *from eternity*; and truly we should not give way to such Disputes, Whether God could have pardoned absolutely, or provided any other way and remedy, when we see God pitching upon this, and the Scripture only revealing this. Hence the Scripture commandeth us to *eschew sins*, not meerly because of his *will only*, but because he is *holy in his nature*, Lev. 11.44. Josh. 24.19. It is true, Gods *hatred* and displacency *of sin cannot but be*, yet the *destination of it actually to punishment* comes in some sense under his *liberty*.

6. It is in Gods freedom to punish sin in the party offending, or in a Surety.

Propos. 6. *Though God cannot but take notice of sinne, so as to punish it, yet it is under his freedom, whether he will punish it in their own persons, or in a surety*, and by this means the wisdom of God found out an excellent temperament of *justice* and *mercy*, so that the one doth not oppose the other; notwithstanding Gods *justice*, yet his *love* and *wisdom* put him upon that remedy, which neither men or Angels could have excogitated; so that God doth not *let sin go unpunished*, only he provideth a *Ram* to be sacrificed for *Isaac*, a *mediator* to come between his *wrath* and *us*. It is true, reason (as we see) doth much gainsay this mystery; but we may say *Mulier ista taceat*, Let this woman hold her peace in the Church of God: Though therefore God cannot but execute justice upon sinners, yet his justice did admit of a temperament, whereby God doth proceed to *see the sins of his people*, to *hate* them, but yet to *punish them upon Christ*.

7. Great difference between Gods justice essentially *ad intra*, and the effects of it *ad extra*.

Propos. 7. *There is a great deal of difference between Justice, as it is an essential property in God* ad intra, *and between the effects of it*, ad extra. These *later* come much under the *liberty* and *freedom of God*, which appeareth in the variety of his judgements upon wicked men, some being consumed one way, and some another, so that it is *meerly at his pleasure*, whether he will stir up *more* or *less wrath*, Psal 2. there is a *little anger* of his spoken of: but you may reade a remarkable expression, *Psal.* 78.38. *He turned away his wrath from them, and stirred not up all his wrath.* Here you see the *anger of God* subject to his *free-will*. If the *effects of Gods justice* should flow from him as burning from fire, or drowning from water, the whole world were not able to in-

dure

dure before him who is a *Consuming fire*. How could it come about, that the wicked do so overflow with prosperity in this world, if so be that God did *necessarily punish* and destroy, which are *effects of his justice*? so that there is a great difference between *Justice* taken for *an attribute*, and *justice* for the *effects*; God cannot but be *alwaies just in the former*, whereas there is a *liberty in the later*. As in man, the *power of laughing* is an *essential property in him*, yet the *act of laughture* ariseth in some measure by the *freeness of his will*. Hence it is, that Gods *essentiall justice doth not receive more or less*, but the *effects of his justice* may be *more or less*: If many men be in the same sin, and God doth punish some of them with a remarkable temporall judgement, we may not say, God dealeth *more justly* with these then the other; yet we may say, the *effects of his Justise* are *greater* upon some then others.

Propos. 8. *Christ satisfied God as a just Judge, not as a Father provoked*, and by this means, though *punishments* are taken away, yet *afflictions for sin* are not; and this doth directly answer the whole question; whereas it is demanded, Seeing Christ fully reconciled God to us, and thereby all *punishments* are taken away, why not as well all *afflictions*? if he hath removed *greater*, will he think much at the *less*? The answer lieth fully in this, Christ by his blood and satisfaction undertook that the *justice* of God should never fall upon us to *punish* us, not that he should never be *angry* with us as a *Father* to chastise us. By this redemption, its Christs will that God should not as a *just Judge*, require *compensation* of us; not, that as a provoked *Father*, he should not *scourge* us for our sins when committed. The reason is clear, because *fatherly anger* is an *effect of love*; but *punishment*, the *fruit of hatred*. And thus now you see, why God will not *see sin to condemnation*, because Christ hath made up that; yet he will *see it in believers* to *angry castigation*, because Christ did not interpose there: it is therefore no derogation to Christs death, no injury to his sufferings, if notwithstanding them, God doth *afflict* for sin, even his own children.

8. Christ satisfied God as a just Judge, not as a Father.

Propos. 9. *By reason of this anger of God against sin, even still abiding, those afflictions which come upon believers, are from a convenincy with the justice of God.* Although we cannot say rigidly,

9. Afflictions on believers agreeable to Gods justice.

That if God did not chastise believers for their sins, he were unjust: yet we may say, his *afflicting of them, is becoming his justice*, partly because he hath prescribed this Law to himself, 1 *Sam.* 7. 14. Even as to *wicked men* upon their *obstinate sinning*, to punish them; so upon his *own*, if they *offend*, to *chasten* them; and partly by *afflicting* of his people for their sinne, he demonstrates the *hatred* of it unto the world. Although therefore, God do not alwaies *chastise* every godly man, but sometimes by their repentance these very chastisements are either prevented or removed, yet when God doth thus *break out in his anger* against them, this is becoming his *just* nature, and the world thereby seeth how he is *displeased* with it. One of the Articles which *Arminius* relateth, as laid against him, was, that he should hold, the *temporall afflictions of believers, were not chastisements but punishments, properly so called.* To this he answereth, *pag.* 103. Resp. ad Articulos 31. *That the calamities inflicted upon* David *for his sin, in the matter of* Uriah, *may be called punishments properly*; and that the Text seemeth to be better explained so, and yet withall, that there will be no favour to the Popish opinion, for he grants that *Christ satisfied both for eternall and temporall punishments*, but yet God when he *takes off the spirituall punishment, may for a while reserve the temporall*, as though Christ hath taken away the *jus*, the *power and right death hath over us*; yet he hath not quite destroyed *actuall death*: but all this is a meer itching, to innovate needlesly in Religion; for if Christ have *satisfied* for *temporall death*, then though it be not removed presently, yet it cannot abide as a *punishment strictly*.

Lect. XIII.

Sheweth, That ſinnes are Debts.

MATTH. 6. 12.

And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.

THis Text ſhall be the laſt (becauſe the nobleſt) to prove, *That God ſeeth ſin in thoſe that are believers:* for if they be bound to pray, that God would *forgive them their debts*, therefore they are *involved in debts*, and in deep humility they are to acknowledge this, withall deſiring the *cancelling* or *blotting them out*; ſo that as the Church anciently uſed this place againſt thoſe *Pelagian* Doctrines, which dreamed of a *perfection in this life*, and immunity from all ſin, no leſſe doth it overthrow thoſe novell Aſſertions, of *being without ſin* (though not *inherently*) yet *as to Gods eye* and account. What *Tertullian* ſaid of the Lords-prayer in general, is moſt true of this Petition, *Quantum ſubſtringitur verbis, tantum diffunditur ſenſibus*, it is as comprehenſive in ſenſe, as ſtraitned in words. So in this Petition you have few leaves of words, but much fruit of matter. Its like Chriſts Muſtard-ſeed, which by a good Interpreters managing, will grow into a tall tree. The material things that belong to remiſſion of ſins, I ſhall incloſe as pertinent to my purpoſe. The Text divided.

In the words you have the Petition it ſelf, *Forgive.*

2. The Subject, *Us*, Diſciples and Believers. He that thinketh himſelf without ſin, that very thought is a ſin in him.

3. The Object or matter of Petition, *Our debts*, that is, as *Luk.* 11. expounds it, *ſins.*

4. The Condition or Qualification of thoſe who are to expect

pect pardon [*As we forgive our debtors*] which words are not to be understood *causally* and *meritoriously of our Justificatio*, nor as if we did hereby teach God *to imitate us*: Therefore those expressions of the Ancients, intimating that in other things we imitate God, but here God doth us, are not rigidly justifiable, *Cassianus Coll.9.c.23* reproveth some, that would not forgive others, but yet lest they should lie in their prayer, they would leave this part out of the Petition: But our Saviour maketh this a necessary qualification for Remission of sin, whether we expresse it or not.

Observables from the connexion.

Lastly, There is the particle of order, *And*; so that the very connexion of it to the Petition for *daily bread*, doth teach us, first, That our hearts are not to stay long in prayer for temporal things, but presently to return to spiritual: As some fowls of the air, suddenly catch their prey off from the ground, but dare not abide, lest they should be ensnared; so ought we to do in our affections about heavenly things: many times the Bee is drowned in its own honey. Hence we have but one Petition for *earthly things*, and *two* for *spiritual things*, belonging to our selves; *this*, and the *Petition following*; In *this*, we pray for *remission of sinne*; in the *following*, for *sanctification*; which are the summe of the New Covenant. Besides this order doth well teach us, That although we have all bodily necessaries, yet if our sinnes are not forgiven we cannot take any delight in any worldly advantage whatsoever.

Why sins are called debts.

I shall begin with the *object* of the Petition, which is in the Text *debts*. *Sins* are so called to *aggravate the nature of them*, and make us more fearfull and cautelous how we run into them. As *Solomon* speaks of Suretiship for another, *deliver thy self like the swift Roe*; the same is much more to be applied to our sins, which are debts of a more terrible nature. Now when *sins* are called *debts*, or said to be *forgiven*, its a Metaphor from *pecuniary debts*, as the *debtor* was said *luere* when he did *pay his money*, and it is generally used of any that are *obnoxious to punishment*; so the Grecians say, ὀφλισκάνω, and the Latins *pœnas debere*. So the Hebrew word חיב is used both for *debts* and *guilt*, Dan.1.10. Ezek.18.7. as also for *sinne*, Exod.32. and ἔνοχος which is applied to a *sinner*, Jam.2.20. is also frequent-

ly

ly uſed of *puniſhments*, as *Matth.* 5. 21, 22. The Obſervation,

Sins are Debts. This is excellently deſcribed, *Matth.* 18. 24. Where *our ſins againſt God* are not only compared to a *debt*, but a debt of a vaſt ſumme, *ten thouſand talents*, which there is no hope for us ever to diſcharge, ſo that the *aggravation* of a ſin lieth in this, that it is *againſt God*; therefore obſerve, that offence which man doth *againſt man*, is compared to an *hundred pence* only, but that which we do *againſt God*, to *ten thouſand talents*. O that men therefore who account it ſuch a miſery and ſlavery to be in *money-debts*, would bemoan their condition of *ſin-debts*. As *ſins* are *debts*, ſo God is ſaid to have a *debt-book*, wherein he writeth all our *tranſgreſſions*: Hence is that phraſe of *blotting them out*, and of *cancelling the handwriting that is againſt us*. This handwriting in the Scripture ſhould as much appale and aſtoniſh us, as that on the wall did *Belſhazzar*. So that phraſe, μὴ λογίζεσθαι, *not to reckon*, or impute, is taken from *accounts in debts*. But to open the point, *Obſerv.* Sins are debts.

1. Let us conſider, *What in ſin is a debt*. And
2. *Why ſins are called debts*. What in ſin is a debt.

In *ſin* there is the *obliquity* and *diſſonancy from the Law of God*; and this is *not called a debt*, for we do not owe this to God, but the contrary, *obedience* and *holineſſe*. In *ſin* there is a *guilt* and *obligation unto eternal puniſhment*, and this is *properly a debt*: but yet in this *Petition* we muſt *not limit it to the later reſpect only*, but *include both*, the *deformity* and *demerit of ſin*, that God would *forgive both*. What it is in ſin that doth denominate a ſinner will in time be diſcuſſed.

2. *Conſider why they are called debts*, and that may be in theſe reſpects, Why ſins are called debts.

1. *Becauſe upon our ſin, we owe God his honour, his glory, yea, his very Deity again, which as much as lieth in us, we by tranſgreſſions have taken away. Omne peccatum eſt quaſi Deicidium*, ſay the Schools, Every ſin doth as it were deprive God (as much as lieth in a ſinner) of his Godhead and bleſſedneſſe; ſo that if God were capable of miſery and grief, thy ſins would bring it upon him. Hence are thoſe expreſſions of being *preſſed by our ſins as a Cart is under ſheaves*, Amos 2. 13. And the Prophet 1. By ſinning we rob God of his honour, glory, &c.

Ezekiel his *lying so many dayes on one side, and then on the other*, to his great pain and trouble, was, as some think, to represent, *How much God was affected with the Israelites sinnes*, and *how great his patience was to endure them so long*. If then they said to *David*, *Thou art worth ten thousand of us*: How much rather may we say to God, Thy honour, thy glory, its worth ten thousand thousand of us? Its fitter for us to be damned, or annihilated, then the least glimpse of his glory obscured. For this is such a *debt in sinne*, as we are never able to make up again. If a mean peasant should defame a great King, and reproach him, he were never able to make satisfaction in way of honour to him, how much rather is this true of us, seeing there is no proportion between that which is finite and infinite?

2. A sinner is a debtor to Gods Justice.

2. *He is a debtor to Gods justice to satisfie that*: and hereby it is, that Christ gave himself a *price for our sins*, and *reconciled God to us*; for we were not in that condition, as to say with the servant in the Parable, *Mat.* 18. *Have patience, and I will pay thee all I owe*. They have low and narrow thoughts of sinne, which think any *external* or *internal humiliation for sin*, can be *satisfactory to Gods justice*. Hence the godly do not (as the Antinomians charge them) put any such *meritorious efficacy*, and *causality in them*. They attribute not that to their *tears*, which belongs to *Christs bloud*; they do not judge their *crucifying sin* to be equivalent with *Christ crucified*; they do not in *practice* that which some have done in *opinion*; say, they are the *Messias* or *Christ*; and certainly if the *Psalmist* say, we cannot ransome our selves from the grave, much lesse can we from hell. Now this *debt of Gods justice* is in *every sin*, the *least idle thought* or *word*: we may say of *every sin pardoned*, here is *the price of blood*, even of *Christs bloud*.

3. Sinners not able to satisfie Gods justice, become debtors to everlasting punishment.

3. *Being not able to satisfie Gods justice*, in the next place, *we by sin become debtors to everlasting punishment in hell*; so that as *the murderer* or *flagitious person* by his crimes, becomes a *debtor* to *the capital punishments* to be inflicted by a Law, so doth a *sinner* to the *Scripture punishments threatned in the Word*, so that *hell* and *damnation* are the proper *wages* that are *due to him*. Oh! how dear doth every pleasant, or profitable sinne cost thee? Thou owest eternal damning for it. *Chrysostom* in his time com-

complained of some in his time, who would say, *Give me that which is sweet,* ἡδονήν, *and let it choke me:* so do all sinners, Give me that sinfull profit and pleasure, though I am obliged to eternal wrath thereby. *Ambrose* thought *wicked men were called debtors, because the devil lends them their lusts and sins as so much money, for which he will exact eternal torment as the usury of them.* Whatsoever it be, certainly this notion of *sins being debts,* ought much to affect and trouble thee. *Thy sins are worse debts then any thou owest.*

4. *In sin we become debtors by this means, All the good we have, whether natural or supernatural, we are betrusted with as so many talents, and for abusing of these, or not improving of them we become debtors unto God.* You have a full Parable to this purpose, *Matth.*25. Where you have *every opportunity,* even the least that *God puts into our hands,* compared to a *talent,* and that for the greatnesse and preciousnesse of it, and a man may be *accountable unto God,* either *propter damnum emergens,* for the losse that comes to our Master therein, or for *lucrum cessans,* the very ceasing of gain. As that servant *who hid his talent in a napkin,* and *returned it safe again,* though he was not guilty of any prodigal decoction of it, yet he is called a *wicked* and *unprofitable servant.* Now, because all our *talents are many,* hence our *debts* do arise to an *infinite summe;* none so *indebted* as those who have *great wealth, great parts, Sicut crescunt dona, sic crescunt rationes donorum,* The more mercies, the greater account to be given. This consideration may deeply humble us.

4. All the good we have, we are betrusted with as so many talents.

As our *sins* are thus *debts,* so we have all naturally the evil *properties,* and wicked customs of ill *debtors.*

And we have the evil properties of debtors.

1. *We are very unwilling to be called to any account:* We do not love to hear of the day of Judgement; we love not that the Ministers of God should tell us of our bils, and hand-writings that are against us. Hence some observe that expression, *Matth.*18.24. When the Master begun to reckon, it is said, *One was brought that owed ten thousand talents, as if it were by force; and he was haled to his Master.* Into what an amazement and astonishment will that voice from Heaven put us into, *Give an account of thy Stewardship,*

1. We are unwilling to be called to an account.

unlesse Christ be our *Surety*, and he undertake to discharge *all*? So that the very word *debts*, may breed in us much *love* to Christ, who was willing to stand engaged *for us*. *Phocian* the *Athenian*, coming to one in publick office, that was very solicitous about giving up his accounts, and (saith he) I am solicitous how I may give no account at all. Thus, if it were possible, would every man be studious how he may decline that day of accounts: How gladly would he have the grave to detain him there alwayes?

2. We are full of shame and fear.

2. *To be full of shame and fear.* Thus are men in *debt*, desirous to lie *latitant*, and *not to be seen*. *Grave vocabulum debitorum*, said *Ambrose*, The name of debts is very dreadfull and terrible. Hence *Ambrose* speaketh of some, who for the shame and distresse thereof, have made away themselves, fearing more, *opprobrium vitæ*, then *mortis periculum*, the reproach of life, then the punishment of death. *Suidas* speaks of a Proverb *in lit. A.* Ἀπὸ πυῤῥὸς καὶ δύσκολον χλωρός, Once red with blushing at the time of borrowing, and afterwards ten times pale for fear of paying. *Canis latrat, & cor tuum palpitat.* Ambr. *de Tob. c.* 7. The dog doth but bark, and thy heart feareth an arrest: and if men have been thus perplexed about *worldly debts*, when yet death would at last release them; how much more may men be afraid of these *spiritual debts*? There was a certain Roman died in a vast summe of debts, which in his life time he concealed, and after his death, when his goods were to be sold, *Augustus* the Emperour sent to buy his pillow he lay upon, because, saith he, I hope that would make me sleep, on which a man so much indebted could take his ease. It is much that we who have so many *debts spiritual*, can sleep, or eat, or drink, till we see them discharged by Christ. Oh that every natural man should not like *Cain*, fear every thing would damn him!

3. Of shifts and delayes.

3. *To shift and put off, to be in continual delayes, and if so, to be no further troubled.* This is a custom in *worldly debts*, if men can shift one way or other, they care not: Hence *Horace* cals the *wicked debtor*, *Sceleratus Proteus, fies aper, modo avis, modo saxum, & cum volet arbor*, become in all shapes, to evade the Creditor, and thus it is in *spiritual debts*. How unwilling to *acknowledge our debts*, to *confesse them to God*? I look upon all Pelagian

lagian Doctrines on one ſide, and Antinomian opinions on the other ſide, which would either make *no ſinne* in us, or at leaſt, not to be *taken notice of* by God, but as ſo many *coſening cheats*, of a *guilty heart*, that is unwilling to be *found a debtor* before God. *Cum delationem impetraveris, gaudes*, ſaid *Ambroſe* of a *Debtor*, If men can but delay, they do rejoyce. And are we not all thus naturally affected, if we can from day to day, get one worldly comfort after another, and ſo be able to ſupport our ſelves, we think all is well? ὁδὸν λυσείτελειαν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τοῦ ζῆν, nothing is more troubleſom then to hear, *Pay what thou oweſt*: Do not therefore pleaſe thy ſelf with delayes and excuſes, leſt thou die in thy miſery.

4. We hate thoſe to whom we are indebted.

4. *To hate thoſe to whom we are indebted: Leve aes alienum debitorem facit, grave inimicum*, A little money borrowed makes a man a debtor, but a great deal, an enemy; and ſo the more they owe, the more they hate; οἱ ὀφείλοντες βέλτιον μὴ εἶναι ὃς ὀφείλων, ſaid *Ariſtotle*, Debtors wiſh their Creditors to have no being, ſuch is the hatred that ariſeth thereby: and this is moſt eminently true in *wicked men*. *They hate God, becauſe they fear him as a juſt Judge, who will ſeverely demand to the laſt farthing*: Comfortable therefore is this direction, to pray in this Petition, for hereby is ſuppoſed, that God is *propitious*, and *ready to releaſe us*; we may have a Jubile every day; No Devil hath any warrant to ſay, *Forgive us our ſins*, God hath caſt them into *utter darkneſſe*, and bound them up in *perpetual chains* for their *debts*, but he is ready to *forgive us*. As therefore we reade of *David*, That *men in debt and diſtreſſe followed him*, hoping thereby to be freed from their Creditors hands, ſo let us follow Chriſt, who only is able to *take off this heavy burden from us*, and know the longer we lie in our *debts*, the more they will increaſe upon us.

In two reſpects ſpiritual debts exceed worldly debts.

Now in two reſpects, *Spiritual debts do exceed worldly debts*:

1. In the danger of non-paiment.

1. *In the danger of non-paiment*: Suppoſe the higheſt puniſhments that we reade of in Hiſtories againſt *perfidious debtors*, yet that doth not amount to the puniſhment of our *ſpiritual debts*. In ſome Laws they were bound to ſell their children, yea themſelves to become ſlaves, *Exod.* 21. 7. *Exod.* 22. 2. *2 King.*

2 *King.*4 1. Thus God commanded in the Jewish Laws. This was very miserable, to have children sold for parents debts. *Valentinian* the Emperour would have such put to death that were not able to pay their debts; but above all, that Law in the twelve Tables, that who was in debt, the Creditors might take him, and cause him to be cut alive in as many pieces as the Creditors pleased. This cruelty, saith *Tertullian*, was afterwards erased out by publick consent, *Suffudere malunt homini sanguinem, quam effundere*, but what is this to that, *Mat.*18.30. *His master was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he had paid all that was due?* So then *chains and imprisonments* are the worst of *worldly debts*, but the *eternal wrath of God*, falleth upon *spiritual debtors*.

3. In the impossibility of escaping this punishment.

2. *In the impossibility of escaping this punishment. In these debts death will free a man: but then is the beginning of our misery by spiritual debts.* So *Matth.* 5.26. *Thou shalt by no means come out, till thou hast paid the utmost farthing*; and because we are never able to do that, therefore must our condemnation be *eternal*. We pity the indebted prisoners, that out of their grates, cry, *Bread, bread*: But how more dolefull is that cry of *Dives* out of hell for a *drop of water, and none giveth unto him?* This is some mitigating consideration to the worst troubles here, that they are *not eternal*; and it is the aggravation of the least in hell, that they *are eternal*. Therefore in that the Scripture cals our sins by these names, and we have an innumerable heap of them, let us mourn under the weight of them, and bewail their burden, and this is to be done with all speed, not knowing how soon justice may take us by the throat, saying, *Pay that thou owest*.

Use of Instruction to the godly.

The Use may be of *Instruction to the godly*, that notwithstanding their *justification*, and *forgivenesse of sins past*, yet they *run into debt daily*, and *such debts, as for the pardon of them, they must renew daily sorrow and confession, as also sue out continual pardon*; for certainly our Saviour did not direct us to say this Petition *humiliter* only, for humility sake, as some of old thought; but also *veraciter*, truly, and if it be true, then we are not in a cold customary way of lukewarmnesse to beg this pardon, but with the same deep sense, conflict and agony of spirit,

ſpirit, as we ſee malefactors importune the Judge for a pardon. Now if there were a malefactor, that thought the Judge ſaw no crimes, nor matter of death in him; but on the contrary, that he was altogether righteous and free, how could this man with any deep remorſe and acknowledgement bewail himſelf? So that this Petition containeth excellent Doctrine as well as practice. *Tertullian* called the Lords-Prayer, *Breviarum Evangelii*, a Breviary or Summe of the Goſpel, for *legem credendi, adde & operandi, lex ſtatuit ſupplicandi*, ſaid another, The Law or Rule of Prayer, teacheth the rule of Faith and practice; and this is very true in this Petition, which teacheth both *Doctrine* and *Practice* againſt the Antinomians. It is true, they make gloſſes upon this Text, but ſuch curſed ones, as do wholly corrupt it; Do not therefore think that *Juſtification* giveth thee ſuch a *quietus eſt*, that new ſins daily committed by thee, ſhould be no matter of humiliation or confeſſion; certainly our Saviours command is, *That we ſhould deſire this forgiveneſſe, as often as we do our daily bread.*

LECT.

Lect. XIV.

That Justified persons are to pray for the Forgiveness of sinne in a proper sense, and not only for the sense of Pardon: With the meaning of the Petition, Forgive us, *&c.*

Matth. 6. 12.

And forgive us our debts.

WE have already considered the *object* in this Petition, *viz. sinnes*, which according to the Syriak Idiotism are called *debts*, as *alms* are called *righteousnes*, v. 1. in an Hebraism. The next thing to be treated of, is the *Petition it self*, *Forgive us*, ἄφες, this word is most commonly used by the Apostles to signifie *pardon of sinne*; they have it about seven and twenty times: but more of this when we shew *what remission of sinnes is*. The work I have for the present to do, is, to shew how *comprehensive* this Petition is, and what it is we *pray for* herein. *Bellarmine* opposing the Doctrine of the Protestants, holding a *speciall* and *peculiar faith*, *appropriating pardon of sin*, mistaking the question, as if we maintained *Justifying faith to be that whereby we believe our sinnes are certainly forgiven us in Christ*, chargeth this absurdity upon us, *lib.* 1. *de Justific. Cap.* 10. That *we take away this Petition in the Lords Prayer*: For saith he, *If I be bound certainly to believe my sins are forgiven already,*

it

it would be as abſurd to pray that God would forgive us our ſins, as to pray Chriſt might be incarnated, ſeeing we believe he was incarnated already. And *l.4. de notis Eccleſiæ*, c.11. he makes this opinion of the Proteſtants, holding *we are righteous before God for Chriſt's ſake, and the believing of this with a ſpeciall faith, to be comparable with any Paradox in the world*, as not being *above* or *beſides*, but plainly *contrary to all reaſon*, and as *that which makes it impoſſible for us to ſay, Forgive us our ſins, unleſs we lie.* It is true, according to the Antinomian Divinity, which ſaith, *there is no ſin now in the Church*, this Prayer doth no more belong to us then to the Angels in heaven: therefore the Antinomian makes not the meaning of this Prayer to be *as if we prayed for the forgiveneſs which we had not before, but only for more full and rich aſſurance of it*: Honey-Comb *pag.*156. But the ſequell will ſhew the falſhood of both theſe Aſſertions.

Obſer. *It is the duty of Juſtified perſons to pray for the forgiveneſs of their ſins.* To underſtand this, we will ſhew, firſt, what is the *expreſs meaning of this Petition*; and then, what is *the implied ſenſe of it.*

Obſerv. It is the duty of juſtified perſons to pray for forgiveneſs of their ſins.

The meaning of the Petition *Forgive us*, &c.

In the firſt place, our meaning in this Petition is, *That God would not require of us the payment and ſatisfaction of his Juſtice for our ſins.* We have a Parable, *Luk.* 16.8. of an *unjuſt ſteward, who called his Lords debtors, who bid him that owed an hundred meaſures of oyl, ſet down fifty*: but if God ſhould condeſcend thus far to us, *inſtead of millions of ſins we owe, to ſet down but an hundred*; yea, ſhould we come down as low in the number of ſins, as *Abraham* of his righteous men, yet that would not avail us. Yea, as long as there is but *a farthing*, the *leaſt ſin unpaid*, ſo long are we unable to *give an account to God.* We therefore deſire of God, *That he would not call upon us to pay for the leaſt vain thought, or idle word, much leſs for thoſe more grievous ſins which we have committed.* As it is, *Not unto us Lord, not unto us, let the glory be given*: ſo *Not of us Lord, not of us, let thy Juſtice be ſatisfied.*

1. That God would not require of us the ſatisfaction of his juſtice for our ſins.

2. We pray, *That God would lay our ſins upon Chriſt, and accept of ſatisfaction in and through him*: for ſeeing God hath declared his will, *that man ſhall die for ſin*; if we ſhould pray, *that God would* abſolutely *forgive our ſins*, it would be to pray, *that he*

2. That God would lay our ſins on Chriſt.

A two-fold difference between Gods forgiving our sins, and our forgiving others.

might be unjust. There is a two-fold difference between *Gods forgiveness of our sins*, and *our forgiving of others*. First, We may, and ought in some cases to *forgive others freely*, without any satisfaction at all, but God hath bound himself to another way. Yet Gods grace is much to be magnified and extolled in pardon, as we shall shew against the Socinian. Again secondly, *We may and ought to forgive others though they do not repent and ask pardon of us*; but God hath declared his will otherwise: we do not therefore pray, *that God would* out of an absolute Sovereignty and dominion *remit our sins*; *but that he would account them upon Christ, and take him for our Surety.* As the Prophets wife who died in debt, was wonderfully relieved by the Prophets oyl, so that she was inabled to satisfie all her creditors; no less advantagious is the blood of Christ to us, whereby the justice of God is appeased towards us. Therefore in this prayer, thus we may argue, O Lord, we call not upon thee to repeal any threatning, to nullifie thy word, to become unjust; but thy wisdom hath found out a way that we may be pardoned, and thou satisfied. Neither will this be any injury to Christ, to lay them upon him though innocent, for this he voluntarily undertook, and he is not made a Surety or Mediator against his will, neither in the midst of all his agonies and troubles he grapled with, did he repent of his Suretiship, or desire to give it over: so that there goeth more to make this Petition good, and possible, then did to make the world at first, for there it cost Christ but a word, *Let there be light, and there was light*, but it is not so here, Let there be pardon, and there shall be pardon; besides Christs speaking, there must be his doing and suffering.

3. As we pray for justification, so for the continuance in it.

3. As we pray thus for *Justification*, so also for *continuance* and *preservation in it*. As we pray for *daily bread, though our store be full*; so, *though our Justification be sure and persevering, yet by Prayer we are to be preserved in it.* A certain knowledge and faith of a thing, takes not away Prayers; we know certainly God will gather a Church, and preserve it to the end of the world; yet we pray, *Thy Kingdom come. Paul* knew, *Act.* 27. 24. that none in the ship with him should perish, because God had given him their lives, yet none can doubt, but he prayed for their preservation, as well as used other means. Howsoever

now

now grievous sins committed by a *David* or *Peter*, may fasten upon them, as the Viper upon *Pauls* hand, yet by the grace of God they shall not be able to unstate them out of Gods favour, but at last their repentance will revive, and so they will sue out a pardon; and certainly Gods power and grace is no less seen in *preserving of us in the state of Justification*, then at first *justifying us*.

4. *We do not only pray for preservation in this estate, but for daily renewed acts of pardon, and imputation of Christs righteousness.* Howsoever, as in the controversall part is to be shewed, *Justification is not reiterated*, but is a state in which we were at first believing put into, without Apostacy from it, either totall or finall; yet those *particular acts of pardon, and imputing of Christs righteousness, are continually by God communicated unto us*: neither may we think *that our sins past, present, and to come, are all taken away by one sentence, so that there is no new or iterated pardon.* Then indeed *Bellarmines* Argument would have strength in it, that it were as absurd to pray for *forgiveness of sin*, as to have *Christ new incarnated*, or that we might be predestinated, according as some have falsly said, *Si non es predestinatus, ora ut predestineris*, If thou art not predestinated, pray that thou mayest be. We might indeed pray for the *believing of these things in a more setled manner, but not for the things themselves.* But this is the proper answer to *Bellarmines* Objection, we pray for *pardon of sin*, and not for the *incarnation of Christ*, or the *making of the world*, because these were so *once done*, that they are never to be *done more*. The incarnation of Christ was once done, and is not to be done again; but *remission of sin is so done*, as that it is *continually to be done for us*, and the *ultimate, compleat effect of it* will then only be, when *sin shall be quite taken away*, so that a *totall* and *full remission* will be only at the *day of judgement*, as appeareth *Act.* 3. 19. *That your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come*: Not but that *every sin here forgiven is fully and perfectly forgiven*, but because we *renew sin daily*, therefore there is need of a *daily pardon*. Away therefore with all such opinions, as shall either plead such an *inherent righteousness* in the Pelagian way, or such an *imputed righteousness* in the Antinomian way, that will overthrow this Petition

4. We pray for daily renewed acts of pardon and imputation of Christs righteousness.

Bellarmines objection answered.

for *forgiveneſs of ſins*. If all thy *former ſins* be forgiven, and no pardon for *future*, thy caſe would be deſperate, for ſinne like *Sampſons* hair though it be cut, yet it will grow again, and come to great ſtrength.

5. We pray for the ſenſe of this pardon in our conſciences more & more.

5. *We pray for the ſenſe and feeling of this pardon in our conſciences more and more.* For although God hath *pardoned our ſin*, yet if we *know not of this*, it taketh off much from our comfort, and Gods glory; we are in this caſe like ſome heir or Prince, that hath many temporall dignities, but by reaſon of his infancy doth not underſtand it. Hence *David*, though *Nathan* told him, *his ſin was pardoned*, yet *Pſal.* 51. he prayeth for *mercy* and *pardon*, and that in a plentifull manner; ſo that although a *ſin* is *perfectly remitted*, ſo that it cannot be *more or leſs forgiven then it is*, yet the *aſſurance* or *knowledge of this may be more or leſs*; and indeed, though to have *ſins pardoned* be an *objective happineſs*, yet to *know that they are pardoned*, is *formall happineſs*; ſo that he is *compleatly happy*, who both *hath his ſins pardoned*, and alſo *knoweth they are ſo*; and this made *David*, Pſal. 103. ſo exult and rejoyce, *Bleſs the Lord, O my ſoul, who forgiveth all thine iniquities*. This particular aſſurance inlarged his heart to praiſes. But although this be part of the ſenſe in this Petition, yet this is not all we pray for, as the Antinomian contends; for we pray principally for the *reall exhibition of pardon*, and ſecondarily for the Declaration and *manifeſtation of it in our conſciences*. Their conceipt is, *That God from all eternity hath pardoned our ſins paſt, preſent and to come, and that when we believe or repent, our ſins are pardoned declaratively only to our conſcience, they being forgiven before*. This I ſhall handle in a queſtion by it ſelf: Only I ſhall lay down ſome few Arguments to prove that we do not only pray for *aſſurance* and *manifeſtation of pardon*, but alſo for *pardon it ſelf*. The reaſons are theſe:

We pray for pardon it ſelf, and not for the ſenſe thereof only.

Reaſons proving this.

1. Reaſon.

First, We might by the ſame rule interpret all the other Petitions in regard of *Declaration only*, and *not exhibition*; when we pray for *ſanctification* and *glorification* in that Petition, *Thy Kingdom come*, it might be as well ſaid that we were *ſanctified* and *glorified from all eternity*; and therefore when we are *converted* or *ſaved in heaven*, this is but to our *ſenſe and feeling*. This Argument ſeemeth to be ſo ſtrong againſt them, that they have

confeſt

confest a *man is already glorified while he is upon earth*, most absurdly confounding the *Decrees of God from eternity* to do things, with the *executions of them in time*. How ridiculous would it be to expound that Petition, *Give us our daily bread*, thus? Not that God should *give us daily bread*, but only *make us taste and feel that he hath given it us*.

A second reason it, from the *nature of forgiveness of sin*. When *sin* is *pardoned*, it is said to be *blotted out*: now that *blotting out* is not only from a mans *conscience* and *feeling*, but more immediatly out of *Gods book*. So that when God doth *forgive*, he doth *cancell those debts which are in his book*, and not only the *guilt that lieth upon our hearts*, therefore these are very separable the one from the other: A man may *feel no weight* or burden of *sin upon him*, and yet it *stand in fiery Characters against him in Gods book*; and on the contrary, a sin may be *blotted out there*, yet be very *heavy and terrible in a mans feeling and apprehension*: so *sin pardoned* is said to be *covered* or *hid*, *not in respect of us*, as if it were taken *from our sight*, but *from Gods sight*, and he is said *to cast our sins behinde his back*, *not ours*. 2. Reason.

The third reason, This explication, as the whole sense of the Petition, would overthrow all other places of Scripture which make *no pardon of sin to be*, but *where the subject hath such qualifications*, as this in the Text of *forgiving others*, it is not indeed put as a *cause* or *merit*, but yet it is as a *qualification of the subject*, therefore our Saviour repeateth this again, *Except ye forgive others, neither will my heavenly Father forgive you*. So *Act.* 10.43. *Whosoever believeth on him, shall have remission of sins* Rom. 3.15. *He is a propitiation through faith in his blood*; here *faith* is made an *instrument* to *apply* and *bring* that *pardon to the soul*, which it had not before. So 1 *Joh.* 1.9. *If we confess our sins, he is faithfull and just to forgive us our sins*. By these and the like Scriptures it is plain, That remission of sin is given us only in the use of these graces: not that hereby we *merit* at Gods hand, or that God is tied to these waies, but it is here, as in the Sacraments, he hath tied himself to convey his graces in no other Chanels or Conduits then he hath appointed. 3. Reason.

Lastly, This would make no difference between *sins repented of* and *not repented of*, for if they be all *pardoned from eternity*, then 4. Reason.

ſins that are *humbled for*, and that are *unhumbled for*, have the like conſideration on Gods part, and I may feel the pardon of the later, though *not repented of*, as well as the former; yea, I may have *the ſenſe of the pardon of all the ſins I ſhall commit for the future*, and ſo whereas I pray for daily bread, not to morrow bread, I ſhall here beg for the *ſenſe of the pardon, not only of my ſins to day, but to morrow, and the next year*: But I never read that God made ſuch a Jubile, as one Pope did, who promiſed a plenary indulgence, not only for ſins paſt, but aforehand alſo, for all ſins to come; God doth not antidate his pardon before the ſinne be committed or repented of, but of this more largely in time.

6. We pray that as God forgives the ſin, ſo he would releaſe the puniſhment.

6. We pray, *that as God doth forgive the ſin, ſo alſo he would releaſe the puniſhments, and take away all the wrath that doth belong to it*. It is but a mockery which Papiſts make about pardon, as if indeed God did *pardon the ſin*, but the *puniſhment* that *abideth* ſtill, and we muſt *work out a releaſe from that by our own ſelves*. It is true as we have proved, God though he doth *pardon ſin*, yet he may *grievouſly afflict*; but theſe are *fatherly chaſtiſments*, not *judiciall puniſhments*: but in this Prayer, we deſire alſo that as the *ſins are removed*, ſo alſo whatſoever *troubles, afflictions* and *chaſtiſements* do remain, that they alſo may be *taken away*; that as the gulf of hell is removed, ſo every Cloud alſo may be diſpelled.

7. We pray to be delivered from the effects of ſin.

7. In this Petition, we pray, *That God would deliver us from thoſe effects of ſin, which God hath immutably ſet upon it*; ſuch as are *ſickneſſes, death* and *corruption*; for although God by vertue of the *Covenant of grace*, hath promiſed a *perfect pardon of ſin*, yet we cannot come to a *full enjoyment of all thoſe priviledges which remiſſion of ſin doth bring, till we be freed from death and corruption*. So that as long as there is the *death* and *grave*, ſtill *ſin* hath ſome *power*. We therefore pray, that whatſoever *mortality* and *corruption ſin hath brought in*, it may be *taken away*, and we made *fit for eternall life*, which is *the conſequent of pardon of ſin*; for you muſt know that *pardon* is not a *meer privative mercy*, freeing us from Gods wrath, but there is alſo a *poſitive inveſting of us with a title to everlaſting life* and *glory*, only our *corruptibility* hinders us from the *actuall poſſeſſion* of that which

we

we have a right unto, we therefore pray, that as God *removed our sins*, so he would also remove all the *sad effects* and mischievous fruit which came in by it.

8. We pray for pardon, and the concomitants thereof.

8. *We pray not only for pardon of sin, but also for the good concomitants, and effects of it*, which are, *Peace with God*, and *joy in the holy Ghost*, Rom. 5. 1. Hence *Luther* speaketh of a two-fold pardon, one *secret* and hidden, when he *forgiveth sins*, but the people of God do *not feel* or *regard it*; The other is *open* and *experimentall*: now both these condonations are necessary; The first (saith he) is more bitter and troublesom, but more noble and acceptable. The first cleanseth, the later pacifieth: The first is of meer faith, and obtaineth much of God; the later is of experience more, and takes off from the excellency of faith: for as that is the best manifestation of love when it is carried out to an enemy; so is that of faith, when relying upon God, though feeling terrours and an hell within us. God useth the first kinde of pardon to more Heroicall Christians. The later to those that are more infirm. An instance of this two-fold remission we have in *Mary Magdalen*; the former, when Christ turned his back on her, and told *Peter much was forgiven her*; the other when he turned towards her, saying, *Thy sins are forgiven thee, go in peace*. Now in our prayer we must not be limited; but as in the Law every Commandment is spirituall, and hath a great latitude in it; so in Prayer every Petition is spirituall, and hath much in it: let us therefore inlarge our hearts, and open them wide, when we seek to God for pardon of sin. The priviledge is exceeding great, and many are the dignities that do depend on it. If thy sins be pardoned, thou becomest a favourite of heaven, there is no contrariety between God and thee. The devil shewed the glory of the world, and falsly said, *All this is mine*, but thou mayest shew all the glory of the Gospel, and promises, yea all the glory of heaven, and say, All this is mine. Yea there is a full reconciliation made between God and that person, notwithstanding all former enmity, as appeareth in the example of the prodigall son, he hath all love, favour and honour again, insomuch that such *come not into judgement*, Joh. 5. 24. *There is no condemnation to them*, Rom. 8. 1. yea there is not so much as any charge or indictment

dictment againſt them. What devil, what conſcience, what Law may accuſe thee, when God juſtifieth thee? Now in this Petition we deſire that not only *pardon of ſin*, but all theſe *bleſſed fruits of it*, may be vouchſafed to us. Oh therefore the congealed and icy temper of men, who are no more inflamed in prayer about this! There are many that can heartily and feelingly pray the former Petition, for the neceſſaries of this life, but how few for the grace of God in pardoning in a ſpirituall manner? Hearken then O man, to what Chriſt hath ſaid is good for thee to importune and ſeek after. *Philo. lib. de Somniis* ſaith, and it was alſo the opinion of Philoſophers, That the heavens make ſuch an harmonious melody, that if the ſound and noiſe of it could reach to our ears, it would make men leave off all their inferiour and ſublunary labor and profit, attending to that only: Certainly this Doctrine of remiſſion of ſin, which is revealed from heaven only, hath ſuch excellent harmony in it of Gods juſtice and his mercy, of Gods ſatisfaction, and our happineſs, that it may juſtly make us forget to eat our bread, or delight in other comforts, meditating of, and being raviſhed with this excellency. Let this then inſtruct thee concerning that neceſſary duty of ſeeking out the pardon of thy ſins; this belongs to every one, though a *Paul*, though a *Moſes*, though in the higheſt form of Chriſtianity. It is a great comfort that all voluntary ſins after grace received, are not unpardonable, as well as that againſt the holy Ghoſt. How often do we ſin voluntarily and willingly after we are inlightned? And then the ſins of infirmity and ignorance are more then the ſands of the ſea ſhoar: Is it not therefore neceſſary that thou ſhouldeſt be continually begging for pardon? Know then that theſe indulgences are not like the Papall, to be bought by money, but they are purchaſed by the blood of Chriſt: *Peter* thought it a great matter to *forgive a brother ſeven times a day*, but if God ſhould not forgive us *ſeventy times ſeven a day*, our condition would be damnable. Thoſe that look to have pardon by their meritorious works, and penall ſatisfactions, cannot look up to God. Whereas all Nations uſed to look up to heaven for rain, *In Ægypto* (ſaith *Seneca*) *nemo aratorum aſpicit cœlum*, &c. No husbandman regards the heavens, but *Nilus* only, from which they have rain;

ſo

so in Popery Christ is neglected, and Angels or Saints set up, as those that can give pardon; men therefore look upon their Pilgrimages, their Penance, as if they were to forgive their sins to their own selves.

LECT. XV.

Shews, What this Petition doth suppose and imply.

MATTH. 6. 12.

And forgive us our Debts.

WE come to shew, What is implied in this Petition, and this may be reduced to three heads:

Three things implied in this Petition.

1. *What is implied in the subject who doth pray.*
2. *What in the object or matter that is prayed for.*
3. *What in respect of the person to whom we do pray.*

For the first: There are many things supposed in those who are to pray thus: As

1. On the part of the subject, or he who prayeth, is implied,

1. That all men are sinful.

1. *That all men, though never so eminently sanctified, yet have sins in them:* And this hath been generally urged by Antiquity against *Pelagians*, who have dreamed of perfect righteousness in this life, as if we might be sons of light, without any spot in us; and that evasion is ridiculous, that we speak this *humiliter*, for humility sake, not *veraciter*, truly: for if we had no sinne, this hypocrisie were enough to make it in us, and 1 *Joh.* 1. 9. putteth it out of all doubt, *If we say we have no sin, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us.* He doth

not ſay, we extoll or lift up our ſelves, and there is no humility in us; but we deceive our ſelves, and there is no truth in us, but we deceive our ſelves, and there is no truth in us: Now this the Apoſtle ſaith immediately upon thoſe words, *The bloud of Chriſt cleanſeth us from all ſinne:* So that whether this cleanſing of Chriſt be underſtood in regard of the filth or guilt of ſinne, its not compleatly fulfilled, till we come into Heaven. So true is that of *Ambroſe, Qui ſemper pecco, debeo ſemper habere medicinam,* I who ſinne alwayes, need forgiveneſſe alwayes. And whereas the Apoſtle ſaith, *We all have ſin,* that is to be underſtood, partly in regard of the vicious affections, and inordinate concupiſcence, which is in every one; and partly in regard of the guilt which doth accompany them; neither may we limit this to ſome, for the Apoſtle puts himſelf in the number of thoſe who ought to ſay ſo. Neither may this be reſtrained, as ſome would have it, to ſins paſt in our former converſation only, although the Apoſtle ſpeak, *v.* 10. in the Preterperfect tenſe, for he ſaith, we ſo ſin, as that *if we confeſſe our ſins, God is faithfull to forgive:* therefore he ſpeaks of ſins, which are yet to be pardoned, and not of thoſe that are paſt only.

I acknowledge it is one thing to ſay, Every man hath ſinne, and another thing, that he ſinneth in every good action he doth; and if this place did not demonſtratively prove it, yet other places do. It is good to obſerve the danger the Apoſtle makes to come from this opinion, That we have no ſinne in us, we deceive our ſelves, and the truth is not in us, and then, which is worſt, *we make God a liar,* who in his Word doth teſtifie of us, as having ſinne in us. So that this opinion argueth thoſe who maintain it, neither to underſtand or firmly beleeve the Scriptures; and this is to be extended to thoſe, who hold no ſinne in us, as to Gods eye, by reaſon of Chriſts righteouſneſſe: For the Scriptures do equally overthrow both. The moſt material Anſwer that I have obſerved by any given to this Argument from our duty of praying for pardon of ſin, is given by *Caſtalio de Juſtific. p.* 63. It is this, *This Prayer is not ſo preſcribed us* (ſaith he) *that we ſhould alwayes pray ſo; and we never reade that any in the Scripture uſed theſe preſcribed words:*

words: Nay (saith he) *we never reade that the Apostles prayed for remission of sins, no, nor Christ never prayed for pardon for them. Therefore the meaning of this Petition must be to pray for pardon as oft as they need it, not that they need it always. Therefore he compareth this Petition to such places, Love your enemies, Agree quickly with your adversary, Honour your father and mother, that is, when you have enemies or adversaries, when you have a father and mother: So here, Pray for pardon, that is, when you have sinned.* But this very Answer needeth a pardon, because it is fraughted with much falshood; for first, Although we reade not that they prayed those expresse words, yet in very addresse to Christ to be instructed how to pray, and our Saviour teaching them to *pray thus*, as one Evangelist; or *after this manner*, as another hath it, it had been hypocrisie and mockery, never to have conformed to it. Besides, our Saviour supposeth they have need of pardon, when he tels them, *Except ye forgive one another, neither will my heavenly Father forgive you*, vers. 15. which implieth their need of pardon. Hence *Matth.*7.11. he cals them evil, *If ye then being evil*, which is not to be understood comparatively in respect of God only, for so the Angels are, *Job* 4.18. but inherently, because of the remainder of that corruption in them. Hence (as you heard) the Apostle *John* puts himself in the number here, *If we say we have no sin*, &c. Certainly the Apostle *Paul* was far from these thoughts, 1 *Tim.*1.18. where he cals himself, *The chiefest of all sinners:* that is, one in the rank of those whose sins had a scarlet hue; and he saith this in the Present tense, not of whom I was chief, but I am chief; for although *Cajetans* Exposition be very probable, that makes this relate not meerly to sinners, but to sinners saved. Thus, Christ came to save sinners, of which saved sinners I am chief; yet the former is not to be rejected; and certainly in some sense every man is bound to think of himself, as a greater sinner then others; As the Pharisee said, *I am not as other men, adulterers, covetous*, &c. The godly man on the contrary, thinketh he is not holy, zealous, sincere, as other godly men are. When *Paul*, Rom.7. complaineth of that evil in him, and law of sin, Can we think he never desired the pardon of it? And when our Saviour,

Joh. 17.17. prayeth God to *sanctifie his Disciples*; what is that but to set them apart for their office, by forgiving their sin, even as *Isaiah* was purified by a live cole from the Altar? As for his parallel places and duties, it is a most absurd comparison; for he may as well say, That the *Kingdom of God*, and *hallowing his Name*, are not constantly to be prayed for, but upon occasion only. Certainly those places of Scripture which make original sin to cleave to us, even as Ivy to the Oak, and which is as leven in us souring every thing we do in some measure: And those places which speak of such a perfection in the Law, that we are never able to perform it, argue a constant abiding principle of sin in us: we may conclude then, that this Petition doth suppose a worm in our best fruit, drosse in our purest gold, and many spots in our choisest beauty. Neither may we dream of such an imputed righteousnesse, as shall take away the necessity of this praying; not that the godly are therefore to be denominated sinners, because we call them godly, though sinne be in them, because Godlinesse is the most noble quality in them, as we call that a field of corn, which yet hath many weeds in it.

2. A sense of sin within us.

A second thing implied, is *feeling of sin a burden and weight upon us*: For none can heartily and with feeling experience importune God for this pardon, but such who are sensible of a pressing load by sin. Hence the Hebrew word *Nasa*, doth signifie (as you heard) the taking of a weight and burden. So the Greek word ἄφεσις is used of deliverance from bonds, *Luk.* 4.18. where what was literally true of the Jews that were in Captivity and prisons, is applied to us spiritually, and the Gospel of Christ is said, *To preach deliverance to the captives*: so that hereby is declared, That as a captive Jew in *Babylon* was wearied with his estate, and did vehemently expect deliverance: no lesse doth a man burdened with sinne, desire a freedom and relaxation. Therefore the time of the Gospel is expressed allusively to the year of *Jubile*, v 19. as that was proclaimed with the sound of a Trumpet, so this by the mouth of the Apostles. How many are there then who pray this prayer, but want much feeling and zeal within! Now sin hath a double weight, one of punishment, the other of offence and displeasure

ſure to God, and in this later we ought eſpecially to groan under it. *Cain* felt a burden of his ſins, and *David* alſo felt a preſſure by them, but the tears of theſe two differed much. The one was meerly becauſe of puniſhment; the other, becauſe it was againſt God, *Againſt thee only have I ſinned.* This inward diſpoſition is that which putteth an excellent reliſh, and high prize upon Chriſt and his benefits. Hence the word to *truſt*, ſignifieth alſo to roll and caſt our burden upon the Lord: As a man who beareth an heavy weight upon his back, being ready to break under it, rols it upon the next ſtall he meets with to eaſe himſelf, *Pſal.* 55.22. Conſider therefore what thou feeleſt within; what preſſures upon thee while thou deſireſt this forgiveneſſe: Art thou as the poor priſoner, bound in his chains and irons, longing for a releaſment? Art thou as one aſhamed in the preſence of ſo glorious a God? *Quidni totis artubus contremiſcat ranuncula è palude accedens ad thronum regis?* Why ſhould not the frog coming out of the lake to the Kings throne altogether tremble?

3. Godly ſorrow for ſin.

3. *It implieth godly ſorrow, and ſpiritual mourning of heart:* For we may not think this is appointed as a meer complement to uſe to God, but our hearts ought to be wounded and melted within us at that time. And indeed why is there a promiſe, *Zech.* 12. for the ſpirit of prayer and mourning together, if it were ſo eaſie and cuſtomary a work? Why (*Rom.* 8) are theſe groans unutterable wrought by the Spirit of God in us at that time? Inſomuch that a ſoul in prayer, is in ſpiritual travel and heavenly agonies: All which cannot be, unleſſe the heart of a man be deeply humbled within for ſinne: ſo that this Petition doth not only imply ſin is in us, and that God ſeeth it, but alſo that all within us ought to be moved and troubled at it. Beg therefore for pardon with the ſame zeal and movings of bowels, as *David* did *Pſal.* 51. who had his broken bones. A tear in our eye for ſin, doth more adorn it, then a jewell doth the ear. Now the Antinomian Doctrine is like an Eaſtern or Northern winde, that drieth up, or bloweth away this ſpiritual rain. If God ſeeth no ſinne in us, then he would ſee no humiliation nor debaſement in us for ſin: and ſo whereas heretofore repentance in believers hath been neceſſary,

now it ſhall be prejudicial to ſalvation, and all ſorrow ſhall be ungodly. What direct *Antipodes* are theſe to Scripture-Directions? Hence they repent that ever they did ſo much repent and look upon their ſorrow for ſinne, as Chriſt upon his enemies, Lord, forgive me, for I did not know what I did. But we have not ſo learned the Goſpel. The people of God, when ſinning, are called upon to afflict themſelves, and to mourn: and becauſe the *Corinthians* did not ſo at firſt, though afterwards they did, therefore the Apoſtle threatens to come with a rod unto them. Take heed then of all Doctrins or practices that may obſtruct the running ſtreams of thy ſoul: Keep thy ſelf alwayes in this ſpiritual ſweat. Take not the limbeck from the fire, that ſo ſpiritual diſtillations may flow continually.

4. Earneſt perſeverance till we obtain.

4. *It ſuppoſeth earneſtneſſe and importunity with perſeverance till we do obtain.* That which is requiſite in every prayer, muſt not be excluded here. Prayer without fervency is like a meſſenger without legs, an arrow without feathers, an Advocate without a tongue. Hence are thoſe phraſes, *Be inſtant in prayer:* and *Watch unto prayer*: and *Pray without ceaſing*. Till the heart be deaded to every creature, and minde this thing only, it will not pray aright. Seeing therefore our bleſſedneſſe and happineſſe is made to conſiſt in this, that our ſins are pardoned, how ought we to lay every thing aſide, till this be vouchſafed unto us! *Hierom* complained of his diſtractions and dulneſſe in prayer, *Siccine putas oraſſe Jonam? ſic Danielem inter leones? ſic latronem in cruce?* Where is thy faith? Did *Jonah* pray thus in the whales belly? Did *Daniel* thus among the lions? Did the thief thus upon the croſſe? If ſpiritual things were as truly and really apprehended by us, as temporal are, how ſhould we bid all comforts ſtand afar off, even refuſing to be comforted, till Gods favour ſhine upon us! *If the frowning of a King be like the roaring of a lion*, how terrible then are the frowns of God for ſin?

5. Conſtant renewed acts of faith.

Laſtly, *It ſuppoſeth in the ſubject, conſtant renewed acts of faith*; For as there is conſtant pardon begged and offered, ſo there muſt be a continual lifting up, and ſtretching out the hand to receive. As the branch in the Olive doth conſtantly ſuck juice and

and nouriſhment, ſo ought we perpetually to be receiving from the fulneſſe of Chriſt. This then is the only grace that hath the promiſe of pardon made to it: although where this is, there will alſo be the preſence of all other graces. Neither may we with *Spalato* judge the diſtinction that is made between faith and other graces in this matter of Juſtification and remiſſion of ſins, a meer metaphyſical ſubtilty and formality, as is to be ſhewed. If therefore thy faith be aſleep within, no marvel if ſuch tempeſts and ſtorms ariſe, that thou fear drowning: As a Tradeſman will part with any thing rather then his tools, for they are inſtrumental to his whole livelihood; ſo above all, we ought to look to our faith.

3. In the object matter we ſuppoſe theſe things:

3. In the object or matter prayed for are implied,

1. *That forgiveneſſe of ſinne may be had after Baptiſm.* That although we ſinne after that ſolemn ſtipulation, yet God will not divorce us, or caſt us (as it were) out of the Ark into the deluge. There have been ſome of old, as the *Novatians*, and *Anabaptiſts* of late, who have maintained, *There is no hope of pardon to thoſe that after their Baptiſm do ſinne*, for there they ſuppoſe is given the plenary remiſſion; but this is falſe and uncomfortable: for we have the inceſtuous perſon after his repentance received into favour again. How deſperate had *Peters* condition been, if this had been true? And when our Saviour bids us *forgive our brother ſeventy times ſeven*, we may not think there is more love in the creature then in the Creatour, and Gods kindeneſſe beyond that of a mans, is moſt emphatically deſcribed, *Jer.* 3. 1. Where God promiſeth a reconciliation to his people, though they played the adultereſſe with him.

1. That forgiveneſs of ſin may be had after Baptiſm.

2. *That we may with hope and faith pray for the pardon of great ſins as well as leſſe.* In Juſtification by Chriſt, greater ſins are as eaſily forgiven as leſſe. Though, as is to be ſhewed, the party offending doth not come by pardon ſo eaſily, and more is required of him; now this is a good cordial to the afflicted ſpirit, who is apt to limit God in his pardon. He may forgive ſuch and ſuch ſins, but can theſe great mountains ever be removed out of his ſight, ſins of ſuch a magnitude and aggravation? But our Saviour doth not determine us in our Petition, but what-

2. That a remiſſion of great ſins may be hoped for.

whatsoever your sins are, pray for the pardon of them. Had it not been a great dishonour to Christ, if any diseased man had said, his malady was greater then Christ could cure; he might heal others, but not him? no lesse injurious is thy doubting, when the greatnesse of thy sin makes thee stagger. The obedience of Christ is as much above thy greatest sin, as Christs person is above thy person.

3. That there is an iteration of pardon.

3. *It supposeth iteration of pardon, that God is not wearied out, neither doth upbraid us.* Who would not think that the soul should be ashamed, and blush to go for the pardon of the same sinnes committed over and over again? How easily might we think, What hope is there to have me speed? Have I not a thousand and thousand times intreated God to forgive me such pride, such vain thoughts, such negligence in his service, and must I still go to ask pardon? How shall I look upinto Heaven any more? And this temptation is more terrible, as is to be shewed, if it be a sinne, or sins of a more grievous nature, that the Petitioner hath been overtaken frequently with; but as we are commanded to forgive to a brother offending in a day many times against us, so may we expect greater things of God. Know then, as we sin daily, so there are outgoings of pardon continually; and the goodnesse of God, doth like the Sun, rejoyce to run his race without any wearinesse.

3. In the person to whom we pray, are implied,
1. That God only can forgive sins.

Lastly, In the Person to whom we pray, there is supposed,

1. *That God only can forgive sins.* This is an incommunicable property of God, *Isa.*43.1. & *Exod.*34.7. it is there reckoned as one of his Prerogatives: Hence *Matth.*9. this is made an Argument of Christs Deity, that by his meer command he forgave sin; for this power to forgive sin, is greater then to create Heaven or Earth, or to work the greatest miracles; Therefore a power to work miracles hath been vouchsafed to the Apostles, but not of forgiving of sin, unlesse declaratively only. When therefore our Saviour, *Matth.*9. asketh *Which is easier, to forgive sinne, or to say, Take up thy bed and walk*, intending by this Miracle to prove, that he did also forgive sinne; it is not spoken as if this later were greater then the

the former, but only the curing of the paralytical man, was a more visible sign to confirm the other; for when they saw that which he commanded accomplished upon the mans body, they might well conclude the other fulfilled in his soul. Now when we say, God only can forgive sinne, this is to be extended, both to the forgivenesse in Heaven, and to that in a mans own conscience; for the former it is plain, because the injury is done only against him, when we sinne; and for the later, it is clear, because he is the Father of Spirits, and so can command whatsoever peace and security he pleaseth in the conscience. We see when Friends and Ministers do pour oyl into a wounded soul, they feel no benefit or refreshment, till God speak to the heart. This is notably asserted by *Elihu*, *Job* 34.29. *When he giveth quietnesse, who then can make trouble? And when he hideth his face, who then can behold him?* Oh therefore with all humble thankfulnesse acknowledge this great mercy of pardon, if thou art made partaker of it; If the Lord should work Miracles for thee, he would not display so much power and mercy, as he doth in this forgivenesse of thy sins.

2. That he takes notice of sinne.

2. *It supposeth God doth see, and take notice of sin in us, after we have believed:* For how can God be said to forgive that which he taketh no notice of? If forgiving be covering of sin, and a blotting it out, then it is seen and open to God, and uncancelled till this be done. Suppose our Saviour had used these words in this Petition, *Cover our iniquities, as we cover the sinnes of others*; would not that expression have necessarily implied, That God did see them, and look on them, till he covered them? Certainly, *Joseph* did upon a good ground abstain from sinne, when he said, *How can I do this, and sinne against God?* that is, who seeth me, and beholdeth me in secret, and will be angry with me? But if God take no notice of my sinne; how can I truly awe my self from sinne, saying, How can I do this evil in Gods eyes? How can I provoke him to anger?

Use. Let the Application then be, *To importune for this mercy of forgivenesse, which makes all other things mercy.* Health, riches, learning, peace, are mercies, if with these there be a par-

don of all our sins, especially be pressed to seek for it from this motive, which I shall only mention at this time, *viz.* That pardon of sin is the only support and help in all miseries and calamities whatsoever. This only can sweeten thy pain, thy poverty, thy fears of death. When the Apostle *Rom.* 5. 1. had spoken of Justification by faith, and the peace we have thereby with God, inferreth from thence, *We glory in tribulation.* Alas, there would be little glory, if at the same time man be against us, and God also. So *Rom.* 8. 33, 34, 37. when the Apostle had gloriously triumphed in this priviledge of Justification, and that none could lay any thing to our charge, then he concludeth, *We are more then Conquerors.* Again, 1 *Pet.* 3. 16, 17, 18. exhorting the people of God to be ready to suffer for well-doing, giveth this reason, *For Christ once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust,* &c. So that no misery or calamity can be joyfully undergone, unlesse the Lord forgive our sins to us. In these times of war, while we have been under continual fears of an enemy, what could rightly support us, but remission of our sins. To have men accusing and condemning of us, but to have God clearing and absolving, this can make an Heaven in the midst of an hell.

LECT.

Lect. XVI.

Setteth forth the nature of sinne in its severall Names, Definition, Effects and Aggravations.

Matth. 6. 12.

Forgive us our debts.

HAving explained this Petition *positively* and *practically*, we come to handle those Questions which may make to the clearing of that truth, which is contained in the Text. And I shall pitch upon those that are usefull and necessary, not on thorny and perplexed. God indeed once spake out of the thorny bush, but seldom doth truth discover her self in those thickets which the Schoolmen have made.

The first in order that should be discussed is, *What remission of sinne is*; Or, What is meant, when we say, God doth forgive sinne? But before we can come to that, another doubt must be rolled out of the way, and that is, *What sinne is*, and *what are the proper effects of sinne?* For a man can never understand, what it is to have sinne *blotted out*, or *taken away*, unless he be first informed what the *nature of sinne is*, and what *effects* it hath wrought upon the sinner. Of this therefore in the first place.

Sin considered four waies.

And first, I shall speak of sinne abstractedly in its own nature.

Secondly, Relatively to the person who sinneth.

Thirdly, The proper effects of it.

Fourthly, The weight or aggravation of every sinne.

I. The names of sinne.

Let us begin with the former. Sinne in the Scripture hath severall names, which do in some measure describe the nature of it. The Hebrew חטא is used commonly for sinne, and it doth in a proper signification, wherein it is once used, denote an aberration from the mark we shot at, *Judg.* 20.16. *Every one could sling stones at an hairs breadth, and not misse*; and from hence metaphorically is signified the nature of sinne, for every mans action is to have an end, which end is manifested by the Scripture; and when a man reacheth not to this, he is said to sinne; answerable unto this word in the Greek is ἁμαρτία, which comes from ἁμαρτάνω, that is, to erre from the scope: And another word παράβασις, which is going beyond the bounds and limits which are set us. Though a learned Critick, *Dieu*, doth make παρὰ, not to signifie *beyond*, but *by*, as if it did denote a negligent and careless passing by the commands of God. Another word is עון which cometh of a word that properly signifieth crookednes and obliquity in the body, and so is applied to the soul, and doth denote perversnes in him that sinneth, and to this may answer ἀνομία, where the particle α, is not to be understood privatively only, but adversatively: for a meer want of the Law may not be a sinne alwaies, but a repugnancy must necessarily be. And thus the word is used, 2 *Thess.* 2.8. 1 *Tim.* 4 9. The Hebrews also expres sinne by פשע which is as much as a defection, or falling off from God; and answerable to this in the Greek is παράπτωμα, which is a falling away from that integrity and purity we either once had, or ought still to have. As for the Latine word *peccatum*, some have derived it from *pellicare*, which is to commit adultery, as if a sinne were so called in the generall, from one kinde of it; and others from *pecus*, because a man in sinne wandera like a beast, or becomes like a beast; yet many conceive the word *peccare* to be a theme it self, and not derived from any other word.

The definition of sinne.

As for the definition of sinne, What it is; though there have been many Disputes about it, and *Chemnitius* wished for one publike definition of it, to which all Churches should agree; yet certainly that of *John* is full and comprehensive enough,

1 *Joh.*

1 Joh. 3.4. *Sinne is the transgression of the Law*: Answerable whereunto is that, 2 Sam 15.24. *I have sinned, for I have transgressed the Commandment of the Lord*: only you must remember not to limit ἀνομία, to a meer want of the Law, but as comprehending that which is against it. Now this definition agreeth both to habituall and actuall sinnes.

To *habituall*, whether it be that *innate* and *imbred of originall sinne*; or whether it be that *habituall voluntarily controlled*, you have both the actuall and habituall ἀνομία, excellently put together, *Rom.* 6.19. *As you have yielded your members servants to iniquity unto iniquity*: where by the former iniquity is meant originall and habituall sinne; by the later, actuall sinne as the fruit of the former. It hath been doubted, how habituall, especially *originall sinne* can be called truly sinne, because it is not *voluntary*: for that *voluntarinesse* should be of the *nature* of sinne, is so universally acknowledged, that neither *doctorum paucitas*, nor *indoctorum turba* do *dissentire*: neither the few Learned men, or the many unlearned did ever gain-say, said *Austin*: And besides, All sinne must be forbidden by a Law, now how are we forbidden to be born without sinne? would not such a prohibition be ridiculous? Of the voluntarinesse of sinne.

Again, The commands of God seem to be for good actions, not for the habits of good actions.

Now although it might fairly be maintained, that τὸ ἄνομον, not τὸ ἀκούσιον, the transgression of a Law, and not voluntarinesse, is of the nature of a sinne; for the Apostle, *Rom.* 7.15. saith, *He doth that which he would not do*; and there are many sinnes of ignorance, which must necessarily be without any expresse act of the will, yet we may with *Austin* call this sin *voluntary*, taking voluntary, as it comprehends the will of *Adam*, that *universall* person, and *principle* in whom we all willed. And by this means, though infants are not in themselves capable of any precept, much lesse before they were born, which they were to accomplish in their own person, yet they were bound up in a command even before they had an actuall being in *Adam*, in whose will they were to fulfill that command, for that command was not given to *Adam* as a single person, but as an universall.

Hence it is that habituall sinne, whether remote, or proxime, is forbidden by the Law of God, which requireth not only good things to be done, but also that they flow from a clear and pure fountain within, even an entire perfection of the nature; so that although infused habits of grace come not under a precept, in respect of the infusing and ingenerating of them, for that is Gods act, and we are not bound to do that, yet they are commanded both before they are infused and after; Before, by the Law, which requireth of us, that inward rectitude, which is now lost; and after they are infused, to be diligent in those pious actions, whereby those habits may be preserved and retained. So that by this we may see a sinne to be, whatsoever doth transgress the Law of God, whether habitually or actually, whether internally or externally, whether by commission, or by omission; and from hence ariseth the curse which the Law pronounceth against sinners, because its broken by them.

II. Of sin relating to the person sinning. A man possibly may not, or rather formally cannot intend sinne.

In the next place, if we speak of sinne as it relates to the person sinning; so there is not required, first, That a man should not intend sinne, and will it as sinne, for that is impossible: even as the understanding cannot assent to any thing false as false, but as the object is either true really or apparently: So neither can the will desire any thing that is evil, as evil, but as it is apparently good. As the devil appeared in *Samuels* clothes, so doth sinne and evil alwaies under the notion of some good or other. Hence the Apostle saith, *Lusts inave*, i. do δελεάζειν, entice a man, as a Fisherman doth the silly fish by the bait upon the hook, which the Apostle elsewhere cals παραλογισμὸν, a deceiving or putting a false syllogism upon our selves. So that they do not sufficiently vindicate the pure providence of God from sin, who say, God doth will the act, but not the deformity, or the evil of it, for so neither doth man will expressly the evil of the act, although in willing that act to which sinne is necessarily annexed, it be interpretatively to will the sin.

Neither secondly is to sinne, to produce sinne, as the proper and immediate *terminus* of our action, for sinne being a privation, or at most a relation, it cannot be the immediate effect of any action. Sinne is not indeed a meer pure privation, such

as

as blindneſſe is, but mixt and compounded, ſuch as ſickneſſe is, which hath both the inordinacy, and want of a good temperament, and alſo the ill humours in it. So that a man ſinneth by producing or doing that action, to which ſinne is annexed. And herein neither do they ſufficiently clear Gods concourſe about ſinne, in ſaying it goeth to the materiall act of ſinne, but not to the immediate obliquity of it. For ſo neither doth man, and indeed ſinne being a privation, or as ſome, a relation, it is impoſſible it ſhould be produced any other way, but by that act unto which it is joyned to, as theft is committed by doing that materiall action, to which that deformity is inſeparably adjoyned. Therefore to ſinne, is to do a thing deficiently from the Law of God, ſo that God in all thoſe ſeverall acts of his about ſinne, whether they be permiſſive or ordinative, is gloriouſly vindicated, becauſe he doth nothing *deficienter*, as failing from that eternall and immutable Law of righteouſneſs, whereas the Angels and man did, miſſing or coming ſhort of the rule, by which they were to be guided: But becauſe this Diſcourſe is more remote to our preſent matter of pardon of ſinne, we come to that which doth more nearly concern it.

III. The proper effect of ſin, which is to make guilty.

Therefore in the third place, there is the proper effect, and conſequent of ſin, which is to make guilty, and oblige to eternall wrath. To omit the many things that are in ſinne, Divines do acknowledge two things in every ſinne, the *macula*, or filth, and the *reatus*, the guilt; which guilt ſome do again diſtinguiſh into the guilt of ſin, which they call the inward dignity and deſert of damnation, which they make inſeparable from ſinne, even as heat is from the fire; and the guilt of puniſhment which they make ſeparable: For the preſent, let us examine, What is that effect of ſinne, whereby a man when a ſinne is committed is truly denominated a ſinner, for ſeeing remiſſion is a taking away of ſinne in that reſpect, whereby we are adjudged and accounted of as ſinners, it is neceſſary to know what that is, which doth ſo conſtitute a ſinner: As for example, *David* after his adultery, *Peter* after his denial, have contracted ſuch a guilt upon them, whereby they are accounted as ſinners, though the acts of their ſins be gone and paſſed; and

in

in this condition they ſtand, till remiſſion or forgiveneſs come, which takes away their ſins. For the underſtanding of this, conſider this foundation, That every ſinne committed by a man, though the ſinne be tranſient, and quickly paſſeth away, yet it doth ſtill continue, and is as it were ſtill in acting, till by remiſſion it be removed. And this conſideration is of great practicall uſe. A man is apt to look upon his ſins committed a long while ago, as thoſe which are paſſed, and are no more to be thought upon; but you muſt know, that there is ſomewaies the ſame with the action of ſinne: ſo that not figuratively, but properly the ſinne it ſelf is ſaid to continue. Thus the Scripture cals ſomething by the name of ſinne, that doth continue, when yet the commiſſion of the ſinne is paſt. As *David* many moneths after he had ſinned, praieth God, *to blot out his ſinne:* why, where was his ſinne? It was committed long before, and it was a tranſient act, but yet *David* by this doth acknowledge that there is ſomething which doth continue that act of ſinne, whereby *David* is as much bound up in his conſcience, as if he had been in the very commiſſion of it. Conſider therefore that till there be a pardon of ſin, though thy ſins have been committed fourty or fifty years ago, yet they are continued ſtill, and thou art truly a ſinner, though ſo many years after, as thou waſt at the firſt committing of them. Sinne is not taken away by length of time, but by ſome gracious act of God vouchſafed unto us: How juſtly may it be feared, that many a mans ſins do ſtill lie at his doors! thou art ſtill in thy ſins, and looked upon as ſo by God; though it may be thou haſt left ſuch ſins many years ago. Thy youthfull ſins it may be, thou haſt left them a long while ago, yet thou art ſtill in them, and they are continued upon thee, till by remiſſion they are taken away. It is not thy other courſe of life and abſtinence from ſinne, that makes a ſinne not to be, but there muſt be ſome gracious act on Gods part, removing of this. Conſider therefore of it, that thy ſoul remaineth as polluted and guilty twenty years after a ſinne, yea a thouſand of years, if thou couldſt live ſo long, as when it was in the very firſt act of ſinne. Remember the action of ſinne doth paſs away, but not the ſinne; you may therefore

ask,

ask, Wherein doth the ſinne continue ſtill? What is that which makes me ſtill to be reputed of as if I were a ſinner in the very act? It is commonly out of the Schoolmen determined, That after a ſinne is committed, there doth remain a *macula*, a blot in the ſoul, and that continuing, the ſinner doth thereby remain obliged unto eternall wrath. That there is ſuch a filth and blot remaining becauſe of ſinne, I ſee generally acknowledged by our Divines: only that Learned *Wcotton* doth much oppoſe it, and ſaith, the Schoolmen have been five hundred years labouring to declare what it is, and are not able to do it. Indeed he grants, That in *Adams* ſinne we may well conceive a blot remaining after the ſinne was committed, becauſe he was indowed with grace; but now in a man grown up that hath grace, no ſinne that he commits takes away his grace, and therefore he is not deprived of that beauty by the blot of ſinne. And as for wicked men, they have no beauty at all in them; and therefore how can ſinne make ſuch a blot in them? There muſt be beauty in them by grace, which is *nitor animæ*, the luſtre of the ſoul, before there can be *macula*, which is the deformity of it. For the right conceiving of this, know; 1. That it is one thing to acknowledge ſuch a defilement and impurity by ſinne abſolutely; and another to acknowledge it ſo, That juſtifying grace or remiſſion of ſinne muſt take that blot away. Herein the Papiſts erre, *That they hold ſinne leaveth ſuch a ſtain, which remiſſion of ſinne taketh away*; whereas indeed there is ſuch a filth by ſinne, but that is taken away by *ſanctifying grace, not juſtifying*; ſo that it is a dangerous errour to ſpeak of ſuch a defilement by ſinne, and then to ſay, God by pardoning takes it away; This were to confound *Juſtification* and *Sanctification*.

Whence comes 1. A ſtain upon the ſoul, taken out by ſanctification.

Lib. de Rec.

But in the ſecond place, we may according to Scripture, ſay, not only in *Adams* ſinne, but in every ſinne we commit there is a blot and ſtain made upon the ſoul, *Mat.* 15.20. Theſe things that come from the heart defile a man, *Epheſ.* 5.27. Sin is compared to a ſpot and wrinkle. So *Rom.* 3.12. All by nature are ſaid to become unprofitable. The Hebrew word in the *Pſalm*, out of which this is taken, ſignifieth corruption or putrefaction,

for ſuch ſinne is to the ſoul; not that you may conceive that the eſſence of the ſoul is naturally corrupted by ſinne, as ruſt doth the iron, and moths the garment; but in a morall ſenſe, by ſin the ſoul in its faculties is diſenabled from doing its duty. Thus the Apoſtle cals ſinnes *dead works*, Heb. 9. 14. not in that ſenſe as if they did bring death to a man, for that the Apoſtle expreſſeth otherwiſe, killing us, when he ſpeaks of the Law; but he cals them *dead works*, becauſe they defile man, as dead carkaſes in the Old Teſtament: For the Apoſtle, *verſ.* 1. ſpake of cleanſing by the bloud of an heifer, which was to be uſed when a man had toucht any dead thing, which made him legally unclean. Thus (ſaith he) Chriſts bloud will cleanſe from ſinne that contaminateth a man. Neither is it neceſſary that grace muſt really have been in the ſoul before, and then ſinne by depriving the ſoul of it, ſo to ſtain it: for its enough that the ſoul ought to have grace in it, though it were not preſent before; as when a man doth not believe Gods Word, though this unbelief do not deprive him of the beauty and grace of faith which he had, yet it doth of that beauty of faith which he ought to have. And thus as particular actuall ſinnes are multiplied; ſo are particular ſtains and defilements alſo encreaſed: we therefore muſt grant a ſtain by ſinne, though this be not that which is removed by remiſſion. Therefore that which continueth a man a ſinner in Gods account, and is to be removed by remiſſion, is that obligation to eternall wrath appointed by God; for as ſoon as a man hath ſinned, there doth accrue to God a morall right (as we may ſpeak with reverence) and power, being a Judge, as thereby he may inflict vengeance upon a ſinner; and in this reſpect ſinne is called an offence, becauſe it doth provoke him, who is a juſt Judge, unto anger and vengeance. This then is that, which makes a ſinne to continue ſtill as if it were in act, becauſe upon the ſinne committed there is an obligation by Gods appointment to everlaſting puniſhment, and when this is taken off, then is God ſaid to forgive; and till it be, ſinne is alive, crying for vengeance, as fiercely, as if it were newly committed. So that the act once committed, that cauſeth the obligation to puniſhment; and this obligation continuing, God doth not forgive.

2. An obligation to eternall puniſhment cancelled by remiſſion.

forgive. When a ſinne is committed it may remain in Gods minde, and in our minde. In our minde by way of guilt and trouble; as *David* ſaid, *His ſinne was alwaies before him*, or elſe in Gods minde, ſo that he doth will the puniſhment of ſuch. Now when God doth forgive, he blots ſinnes out of his minde, and remembers them no more. He doth not will the obligation of them to puniſhment, being ſatisfied thorow Chriſt, and the party believing in him. By all this you may ſee, That after a ſinne is committed there remaineth obligation in the will and minde of God to eternall puniſhment, and God when he doth forgive, cancelleth this debt or obligation. This being cleared, we may the eaſilier judge with what act God doth forgive ſinne; but of that hereafter.

Let us conſider the aggravation of ſin, as it is an offence to God, which may the more inſtigate us to pardon. In ſinne we may conſider two things: Firſt, The deprivation of that rectitude which ought to be in every thing we do: in which ſenſe, ſinne is a morall monſter, as there are naturall monſters; for the ſoul in ſin doth not bring forth fruit anſwerable unto reaſon, and the Law of God; this conſideration may much humble us; but there is another thing in ſin which doth more aggravate it, and that is as it is a diſhonour and an offence to God, and by this means it becometh above our power ever to ſatisfie God for it. Therefore in every ſin beſides the particular conſiderations, look upon that generall one, which is in all, *viz.* That peculiar deformity it hath, as it is an offence againſt God. Its diſputed, Whether ſin have an infinite evil and deformity in it? To anſwer this, If a ſin be conſidered in its kinde, ſo its not infinite, becauſe one ſin is ſo determined to its kinde, that it is not another ſin, as theft is not murder.

Sin conſidered as an offence to God.

Whether ſin be an infinite evil.

Neither ſecondly can ſin be ſaid to be infinite evil, in reſpect of the being of it, for it cometh from finite creatures, who are not able to do any thing infinite; and therefore ſin is not infinite, as Chriſts merits are infinite, which are ſo, becauſe of the dignity and worth of the perſon, though the actions themſelves had a finite being. Beſides, if ſins were infinite in ſuch a ſenſe, then no ſin could be greater then another, becauſe that which is truly infinite cannot be made more or leſs.

Therefore thirdly, Sins are said to have infinite evil in them, in respect of the object or person against whom they are committed, *viz.* God, who is an infinite object. For seeing the aggravation of a sinne ariseth from the worth of the person against whom it is committed, if the person offended be of infinite honour and dignity, then the offence done against such an one, hath an infinite evil and wickedness in it. So that the infiniteness of sin ariseth wholly from the externall consideration of God against whom it is. But of this more when we speak of the necessity of Christs satisfaction to Gods justice by his death.

Use. Let the Use be to inform thee, That every sinne committed, continueth as fresh to cry vengeance many years after, as if it were but lately done, till remitted by God. Think not therefore that time will wear it out, though they may wear out of thy conscience, yet they cannot out of Gods minde. Consider that of *Job* 14.17. *Thou sealest up my transgression as in a bag, and thou sewest up mine iniquity.* So that what the Apostle speaks of some, 2 *Pet.* 2. is true of all impenitent sinners, *Their damnation slumbereth not, nor doth it linger.* Therefore till the mercy of God hath taken off this guilt, thou art to be in as much fear and trembling, as if the very sinnes were still committed by thee.

Lect. XVII.

An Enquiry into the Nature of Forgiveneſſe of Sinne. *Divers Greek words that expreſſe this Mercy. And the Neceſsity of Faith and Repentance, in order to Pardon.*

Mat. 6. 12.

And forgive us our Debts.

The next Queſtion to be handled is, *What Remiſſion of ſins is*, and how God doth forgive them. And although the diſcuſſing of the former Queſtion, *viz. What maketh a man a ſinner*, doth make an eaſie and quick way of diſpatching this, becauſe Juſtification doth take off that conſideration and reſpect of a ſinner from a man; yet that the whole nature of it may be better underſtood, I ſhall lay down ſeveral Propoſitions, all which will tend to give us much light in this great and glorious benefit of the Goſpel. What remiſſion of ſin is.

And in the firſt place, as we formerly conſidered ſome choice Hebrew words that ſet forth the pardon of ſin, ſo now let us take notice of ſome Greek words in the New Teſtament, that expreſſe this gracious act of God: for the holy Ghoſt knoweth beſt in what words to repreſent this glorious mercy to us. From the names of it.

The word that is most frequently used by the Evangelists and Apostles, is ἀφίημι, which in the general is as much as to *dismisse*, or *send away*, *to let alone*, *to leave*, *to permit or suffer*; in which senses the Scripture often useth it: and certainly, God in this sense doth pardon sin, because he lets it alone, he leaves it, he meddles no more with it, but handleth the person forgiven, as if he never had been a sinner. But commonly this word is used of absolving those who are accused as guilty, which appeareth in that famous sentence of *Agesilaus*, who writing to have one *Nicias* sent to him that was accused, useth this expression, Νικίαν, εἰ μὲν οὐκ ἀδικεῖ ἄφες, εἰ δ' ἀδικεῖ, ἐμοὶ ἄφες, πάντως δ' ἄφες, *Nicias, if he have done no wrong, absolve him; if he have, absolve him for my sake; but howsoever absolve him, or set him free.* And in this sense forgivenesse of sins may well be called ἄφεσις, but in the Scripture it seemeth rather to be an expression from those that are loosened out of their bonds for their debts; and therefore frequently is applied to the forgiving of debts, *Matth.* 18. 25, 27, 32. and this is more notably set down, *Luk.* 4. 18. to preach to captives or prisoners, ἄφεσιν, *freedom*, or *forgivenesse of sin*, and so ἀφίημι shall be as much as ἀνίημι, to *loosen bonds*, as the word is used *Luk.* 16. 26. *Act.* 27. 40. Therefore howsoever *Grotius* thinks the word *to remit* to a Metaphor from those who part with, or leave a thing that they might retain, yet it seemeth rather to be taken from releasing of debts, and loosening of bonds, in which the conscience of a sinner was tied, being bound to answer it at the tribunal of God. Hence the Scripture useth several names to expresse pardon of sin, according to the several titles that sin hath in the Scripture. As sins are *debita*, debts, so God doth forgive; as they are *sordes*, a filth and loathsomnesse, so God doth cover them; as they are *vincula*, bonds, so he doth remit them. As they are debts written down in a book, so he blots them out: As they make us miserable and wretched, so he is mercifull and propitious in removing of them.

A second word is χαρίζομαι, *Col.* 2. 13. *Having forgiven you all trespasses*, Col. 3. 13. *Even as Christ forgave us.* Now this word doth excellently signifie the fountain, and the effect of pardon. The fountain, that it cometh from the meer grace and favour of God.

God. There is nothing in us to merit or satisfie God with. Therefore howsoever there be a necessity of faith and repentance, yea and God will not forgive sinne in persons grown up, but where these are, yet these are no meritorious causes, nor can they satisfie God for all that offence and dishonour which our sins have cast upon him. And this may encourage the broken heart, who feeleth a load of sin upon it self, and hath nothing to bring unto God: Remember the root and fountain of all forgivenesse is Grace, which is so far from supposing any worth of condignity in thee for pardon, that it rather implieth the contrary. And as it doth imply grace thus in the fountain, so also acceptableneſse and joy too in the party, to whom sinne is forgiven. So that there can be nothing in the world more welcome, or a greater matter of joy, then to bring this glad tidings; and indeed therefore is the Gospel called εὐαγγέλιον, because it preacheth the glad tidings of Gods love and reconciliation thorow Christ with a sinner.

A third word is ἱλάσκομαι, thus the Publican prayed, *Luk.* 18.3. Some derive ἱλάσκομαι from ἵημι λάαν, because we desire to look on those to whom we are propitious. But this word doth more immediately relate to the bloud of Christ, as the way by which God becomes thus pacified. So that as the other words set up the grace of God in pardoning, so this the merits and satisfaction of Christ, 1 *Joh.* 2.2. 1 *Joh.* 4.10. *Rom.* 3.25. *Heb.* 2.17. In which places the appeasment of God towards us, is attributed to the bloud of Christ. Therefore if we put the former words and these together, we may see an admirable temperament and mixture of grace and justice in forgiving of sins. The former places exclude *Popish* Doctrins; The later, *Socinian* blasphemies.

A fourth word may be ἐλεάω, *to obtain mercy*. For although the Scripture apply this to all the benefits and mercies of God, yet *Paul* applieth it more particularly to pardon of sin, 1 *Tim.* 1.13. and when *Dives* prayed, *Luke* 16.24. *Father Abraham*, ἐλέησόν με, *have mercy on me*, and so by consequent to be removed from that place of torment. Hence in that form of prayer which *Paul* useth by way of Salutation, there are these three words, χάρις, ἔλεος and εἰρήνη. But this word is more expressly used for this end in the grand Covenant and Promise for pardon

don of sin, *Heb.*8.12. *For I will be merciful to their iniquities, &c.* This is so comprehensive a Petition, that it seemeth to be a generally received form of Prayer in the Church, κύριε ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, yea the wiser among the Heathens used this prayer, as appeareth by *Arrianus epict. diss. lib.*2.*c.*7. Τὸν Δία ἐπικαλούμενοι, λοιμὸν αὐτὸν, κύριε ἐλέησον; Now this word supposeth, 1. The party praying for pardon to look upon himself, as in a most miserable and undone estate, that no outward calamity or evil lieth so heavily upon him, as his sins do. And then secondly, on Gods part, it supposeth that he doth not only pardon, but that even his bowels yearn within him, when he doth forgive. Hence *Luk.*1.78. they are called σπλάγχνα ἐλέους, the bowels of mercy. This goodnesse of God is excellently represented in the father of the Prodigal, *Luk.* 15.20. Therefore how great a sinne is unbelief, and refusing to have good thoughts of God, when God hath manifested himself thus gracious!

The last word I shall mention (though there be others that are used) is by way of negation, οὐ λογίζεσθαι, *Rom.*4.8. 2 *Cor.* 5.9. And this is a Metaphor from those that cast up their accounts, and account so much upon such an one for debt. Now by this word is shewn the terrible nature of sinne, as also that howsoever for a while, we may live jollily, care for nothing, and be in security, yet God will one day cast up his accounts, and charge such and such debts upon us; but if so be the Lord will not impute them to us, and account them upon our score, this will be our blessednesse. And thus you have heard the most choice and principal words the holy Ghost expresseth our forgivenesse by. We proceed,

*Propos.*1. *Propos.*1. Lay this down as a foundation, *That when God doth pardon sin, he takes it away so, as that the party acquitted is no more looked upon as a sinner.*

All the expressions about pardon amount to thus much; even as when one accused of theft and murder in the Commonwealth, and is legally acquitted by the Judge, he is no more reputed a thief or murderer. Therefore it is a calumny of the Papists, as if we held, That a man is a sinner after God hath pardoned him. It is true, we say, That sin doth remain in a man, though he be

be juſtified, and that ſin hath a deſert of condemnation with it, but where God hath pardoned, there he doth not look upon that man as a ſinner, but as a juſt man. Therefore in different reſpects we may ſay, That pardon of ſin is an utter abolition of it, and it is not an utter abolition it. It is an utter abolition of it, as it doth reflect upon the perſon making him guilty, and obliging him actually to condemnation; in this reſpect a man is as free as if he had never ſinned; but if you ſpeak of the inherency of ſin, and the effects of original corruption that do abide in all, which are alſo truly and properly ſins; ſo pardon of ſin is not an utter abolition; and although Chriſt wrought no *ſemiplenam curationem*, as is obſerved, no half-cures upon any diſeaſed perſons, but whom he healed, he healed perfectly; yet he works by degrees in the grace of *ſanctification*, as he did perfect the world by ſeveral degrees ſucceſſively, and not (as *Auſtin* thought) all at once. So that this particular, *viz.* That forgiveneſſe is a perfect abolition of ſin in the former conſideration, is of tranſcendent comfort to the believers: and indeed it is impoſſible that ſin ſhould be forgiven diviſibly, and by parts: ſo a man ſhould be at the ſame time under the favour of God, and under his hatred, which is impoſſible.

Thou therefore who art a believer haſt cauſe to rejoyce, for this perfect work of remiſſion of thy ſins paſt, wherein nothing more is, or can be done for thy good and conſolation. Do not think it is with God as with men, who ſay indeed, they forgive with all their heart, yet retain their ſecret, inward hatred, as much as before. Indeed the pain of ſin may roll and tumble in thy conſcience a long while after, though it be forgiven (we ſee ſo in *David*) as the ſea, which hath been enraged by tempeſts and winds, though they be quiet, yet the ſea will roar, and make a noiſe a long time after. The heart of a man awakened and pierced with the guilt of ſin, doth not quickly and eaſily compoſe it ſelf again.

Propoſ. 2. *It is one thing for God to forgive, and another thing yet to exact and demand puniſhments.* Propoſ. 2.

As we ſee among men, a Judge many times through fear or otherwiſe, when Juſtice is obſtructed, doth not call ſuch a malefactour to an account, but deferreth it; yet for all that, the man

is not acquitted; ſo it is often to be ſeen in Gods providence. There are multitudes of ſinners, who after their tranſgreſſions committed, are not only without puniſhment, but enjoy great proſperity, and much outward ſucceſſe, yet theſe men are not pardoned, they have no acquittance from God. This hath been ſuch a temptation to *David*, *Jeremiah*, and others of Gods people, that they have many times ſtaggered through unbelief. But men may have their puniſhments deferred, their damnation may ſleep or linger, but it is not taken off.

Let not men therefore delude themſelves with vain hopes, as if their ſins were forgiven, becauſe not yet puniſhed: No, there muſt be ſome poſitive gracious act of God to acquit thee, elſe thy ſins are alive to condemn thee. Examine thy ſelf therefore whether thy peace, comfort, plenty be a fruit of Gods forbearance meerly, or of his acquittance. This later is alwayes an act of his gracious mercy: but the other may be a terrible fruit of his hatred againſt thee, inſomuch that thou hadſt better wander up and down like *Cain*, fearing every thing will kill thee or damn thee, then be in ſuch ſecurity.

Prop. 3. Propoſ. 3. *A godly man may account not only himſelf bound to thank God for the pardon of thoſe ſins he hath committed, but he is to acknowledge ſo many pardons, as by the grace of God he hath been preſerved from ſin.*

And if a believer enter into this conſideration, how will it overwhelm him! So often as God hath preſerved thee from ſuch and ſuch ſins, which thy own heart, or temptations would have enclined thee to, God hath virtually given thee ſo many pardons. That God preſerved *David* from killing *Nabal* and his family, here was interpretatively as great mercy, as in the expreſſe forgiving of the murder of *Uriah*. It is a rule of Divines, *Plures ſunt gratiæ privativæ, quàm poſitivæ*, There are more preventing graces then poſitive. The keeping of evils from us, is more then the good he beſtoweth on us. Therefore *Auſtin* obſerved well, that as *Paul* ſaid, *By the grace of God I am what I am*: So he might alſo have ſaid, *By the grace of God I am not what I am not*. Though therefore we are not ſo ſenſible of *preventing* mercies, as of *poſitive*, yet a due and right conſideration of Gods love in this matter might much inflame

our

our hearts! Say therefore, O Lord, I bleſſe thee, not only for the pardon of thoſe ſins I have committed, but alſo for thy goodneſſe in preſerving me from thoſe many thouſands I was prone to fall into, which is in effect the pardon of ſo many.

Propoſ.4. *Remiſſion of ſin is not to be conſidered meerly as removing of evil, but alſo as beſtowing of good.* Propoſ.4.

It is not only *ablativa mali*, but *collativa boni*: it is not a meer *negation* of puniſhment due to us, but a plentiful *vouchſafing* of many gracious favours to us, ſuch as a *Sonſhip*, and a right to eternal life, as alſo *peace with God*, and *communion with him*. God alſo never pardons any ſin, but where he ſanctifieth the nature of ſuch an one. Indeed it will be worth the inquiry, Whether this connexion of pardon of ſin with inherent holines, ariſe from a natural neceſſity, ſo that one cannot be without the other: or Whether it be by the meer *poſitive will*, and appointment of God. For the preſent this is enough, God hath revealed he will never diſ-joyn theſe.

Propoſ.5. *In every ſin there are* (as to the purpoſe of Juſtification, theſe two things conſiderable) *the offence that is done to God, whereby he is diſpleaſed: and the obligation of the man ſo offending him, to eternal condemnation.* Propoſ.5.

Now remiſſion of ſin doth wholly lie in removing of theſe two: ſo that when God doth will neither to *puniſh* or to be *offended* with the perſon, then he is ſaid to forgive. We muſt not therefore ſpeak of two kinds of remiſſions, *one* remiſſion of the puniſhment, *another* of the *offence* and *fault*; For this is *one* remiſſion, and God never doth the one without the other. It is true, there remain paternal and medicinal chaſtiſements after ſin is forgiven, but no offence or puniſhment ſtrictly ſo taken. What kinde of act this remiſſion is, whether immanent or tranſient, is to be ſhewed in the next Queſtion.

Propoſ.6. From the former Propoſition this followeth, Propoſ.6.

That ſinne in the guilt of is not remitted by any act that we do, but it is a meer act of God. So that neither the grace of repentance, or love of God is that which removeth guilt out of the ſoul, but it is ſomething in God only. It is the opinion of many Papiſts, That God in pardoning doth onely enable to repent

for ſin, and then the guilt of ſin doth naturally and neceſſarily go away, ſo that there needeth no acceptation from God, or act of remiſſion, but only an infuſion of grace to repent. But this in the next Sermon ſhall mainly be inſiſted upon, and it is of great practical uſe, to take us off from having confidence, and truſt in our ſorrow for ſin. For as when a Creditour doth forgive his debtour, it is the ſole act of the Creditour, not any thing of the debtour: So in pardoning, it is not any thing that we do, though with never ſo much love and brokenneſſe of heart, that doth releaſe and unty the bond of ſin, but it is an act of God onely.

Object. If you ſay, Why then is repentance and faith preſſed ſo neceſſarily, that God doth not forgive without it? for if it be only an act of Gods, then it may be done without any work of the ſinner intervening; but of this in the next place, only for the preſent take notice, That it is not any ſorrow or retractation of

Anſw. ours, that makes a ſin either remiſſible or actually remitted, but a meer act of Gods; and if all the men of the world were askt this Queſtion, What they mean, when they pray God to forgive their ſins? The ſenſe of all would be, not that they ſhould do ſomething which would remit them, but that God by his gracious favour would releaſe them. So then, if all theſe particulars be caſt up together, you may clearly conceive, how God doth forgive ſin, not by infuſing or putting grace into us, which may expell ſin, as light doth darkneſſe; but by his outward grace and favour accepting of us: and therefore we are not to rely upon any thing we do, not to preſume, no not of our godly ſorrow for ſin, but to look up to heaven, deſiring God would ſpeak the word, that he would pronounce the ſentence of abſolution.

Let the Uſe be, *To look upon our ſelves as bound in chains and fetters by our ſins*, as made very miſerable by them, that ſo we may the more earneſtly deſire pardon, and put an high prize upon it. Though Gods forgiving be not the putting off godly ſorrow, and the working of a broken heart within us, yet we can never obtain the one without the other. The grace and mercy of a pardon is no more eſteemed by us, becauſe we look not upon our ſelves as ſo many guilty perſons adjudged to eternal death.

de ath. Thus the Publican cried out, *Have mercy upon me a ſinner.* What *Plutarch* ſaid of the Husbandman, *That it was a pleaſant ſight to him to ſee the ears of corn bending to the earth,* becauſe that was an argument of fruit within; No leſſe joyfull is it to ſpiritual Husbandmen to ſee their people walk with humble, debaſed, broken hearts, through ſenſe of ſin, and not to walk confidently and delicately, like *Agag*, ſaying, *The worſt is paſt.* God ſaid of *Ahab*, though humbled for external motives only, *Seeſt thou how Ahab humbleth himſelf?* How much more will God take notice of thoſe who humble themſelves upon ſpiritual grounds, deſiring eaſe from Chriſt! As therefore *Bernard* writing to one, *Epiſt.* 180. whom he thought was not ſolicitous enough about the judgements of God, in ſtead of wiſhing him, according to the ordinary cuſtome of ſalutation, *Salutem plurimam*, much health, ſaid, *Timorem plurimum*, much fear: So may the Miniſters of God, We wiſh you not *much joy, but much holy fear.* Alas thou feareſt pain, poverty, death, but the guilt of ſinne is chiefly to be feared, but we like children are afraid of a vizard, and do not fear the fire, which is a real danger.

LECT.

Lect. XVIII.

The necessity of Repentance *in order to Forgiveness: And how it consists with Gods Free-grace in remitting.*

Matth. 6. 12.

And forgive us our debts.

YOu have heard, Pardon of sin is Gods work only, as also his manner of doing it, is not by infusing grace into us, which takes away the guilt of sin, but besides grace sanctifying, there is also an act of Gods part repealing the sentence of condemnation against us. Now because this may seem to overthrow the duty of repentance: and because this is the rock many have been split upon, not being able to reconcile our duty of repentance, with Gods gracious favour of pardoning; I shall speak, though not all, yet as much as relateth to my purpose in hand, concerning the duty and necessity of repentance, although there be no *causality* or *merit* in it to take away sin, and this may rightly inform us about the true efficacy of our sorrow for sin.

To open this Truth, consider these Propositions:

Prop. 1. First, *That God doth never remit or forgive sinne, but where also he giveth a mollified and softened heart to repent.*

The Scripture doth abundantly confirm this by precepts and examples. It is indeed disputed by the Schoolmen (as you have heard) whether God by his absolute power might not forgive sin without *sanctification* of our natures, and the grace of *repentance*;

pentance; for seeing they are two distinct mercies, why may not God separate the one from the other? But it is a vain thing to dispute what God might do, when he hath revealed what he will do. And although we cannot say, That there is a *naturall necessity* between Justification and Sanctification, such as is between the light and heat in the fire; yet this conjoyning of them together by Gods will and appointment, ariseth from a *condecency* and *fitness* both to God himself, who is an holy God, and to the nature of the mercy, which is the taking and removing of sin away.

2. *Although the Scripture attribute pardon of sin to many qualifications in a man, yet repentance is the most express and proper duty.* Prop. 2.

The Scripture sometimes makes *forgiving of others* a necessary disposition, sometimes *confessing and forsaking of them*, sometimes *believing* (though that hath a peculiar nature in receiving of pardon, which other graces have not; and therefore faith obtaineth pardon by way of an instrument applying, which other graces doe not) But if we speak of the *express formall qualification*, it is repentance of our sins, not repentance as it is a meer, bare terrour upon thy heart, but as it is sweetned with *Evangelicall* considerations. *Luther* said, *There was no word so terrible unto him, and which his soul did more hate then that (repent.)* But it was because he understood not Gospel-grounds. We reade then of some places of Scripture, which make God to be the only *Author* of blotting out and pardoning sinne. And again we reade of other places, where God doth this for none, but the *broken and contrite heart*. Now both these places must not be opposed to each other: neither may we so dwell upon the one, as to neglect the other; so to look upon it as Gods act, as if there were nothing required in us: and again so to look upon that which we do, as if God were not to be acknowledged.

3. *None may believe or conclude that their sins are pardoned before they have repented.* Prop 3.

To this I shall speak more particularly, when I handle the doctrine of Justification before faith. As for the *assertion* it self, it is plain by all those places of Scripture which make repentance requisite

requisite to pardon, *Ezek.*14.6. *Ezek.*18.30. *Mat.*3.2. *Luke* 13.3. The Learned Doctor *Twisse*, *Vindic.grat. pag.*18. confesseth that there are arguments on both sides in the Scripture: Sometimes he saith, Pardon of sinne is subjoyned to confession and repentance, of which sort he confesseth there are more frequent and expres places; but yet sometimes, remission of sinne already obtained, is made an argument to move to repentance, and he instanceth in *David* and *Mary Magdalen*, who did abundantly and plentifully break out into tears, upon the sense of pardon. But these instances are not to the purpose, for *David* repented of his wickedness, before *Nathan* told him that his sinne was taken away; and his penitentiall Psalm was not made so much for the first pardon of his sinne, as the confirming and assuring of him in his pardon. Thus it was also with *Mary Magdalen*. But more of this in time.

Prop. 4. 4. *There is a necessity of repentance if We would have pardon*, both by a necessity *of precept or command*; as also by a *necessity of means and a way*.

Whatsoever is necessary, *necessitate medii*, by a necessity of means or a way, is also necessary by a necessity of command, though not *è contra*. That repentance is necessary by way of a *command*, is plain by the places fore-quoted, and in innumerable other places. I do not handle the case, Whether an *actuall or explicit* repentance be necessary to salvation of every sinner; but I speak in the generall. It is disputed, Whether it be a *naturall* precept, or a meer *positive* command; and if it be a natural or moral command, to which command it is reduced? Those that would have it under the command of *Thou shalt not kill*, as if there were commanded a care of our souls, that they should not be damned, are ignorant of the true limits and bounds of the severall Commandments. It's disputed also, When this time of repentance doth binde? It is a wonder that some should limit it only to times of *danger* and *fear of death*. Certainly this command bindes as soon as ever a man hath sinned, *Venenata inducias non patiuntur*, A man that hath swallowed down poyson, is not to linger, but presently to expell it. And one that is wounded, who lieth bleeding, doth presently dispatch with all readines for Physitians, to have his bloud stopt:

stopt: and thus ought men to take the first opportunity. Hence in that famous miracle wrought at the pool of *Bethesda*, not the second or third, but he that stept first into it was the only man that was healed. As repentance is thus necessary by way of *command*, so also by way of *means*: for the Spirit of God worketh this in a man, to *qualifie* him for this pardon; So that although there be no *causality*, *condignity* or *merit* in our repentance, yet it is of that nature, that God doth ordain and appoint it a way for pardon: So that the command for repentance is not like those positive commands of the Sacraments, wherein the *will* of the Law-giver is meerly the ground of the duty; but there is also a *fitness in the thing* it should be so; even as among men, nature teacheth, That the injurious person should be sorry, and ask forgiveness before he be pardoned.

5. Two great practicall mistakes concerning repentance observed. The first of the prophane man.

5. Concerning this duty of repentance, there are *two extream practicall mistakes*; the one is of the prophane, secure man, who makes every empty and heartless invocation of mercy, to be the repentance spoken of in the Scripture, whereas repentance is a duty compounded of many ingredients, and so many things go to the very essence, yea the lowest degree of godly sorrow, that by Scripture rules we may say, Repentance is rarely to be seen any where; for if you do regard the nature if it, it is a broken and a contrite heart. Now how little of the heart is in most mens humiliations? men being *humiliati magis quam humiles*, as *Bernard* said; *humbled* and brought low by the hand of God, rather then *humble* and lowly in their own souls. Again if you consider the efficient cause, it is from the Spirit of God, the spring of sorrow must arise from this hill, *Zech.*12. *Rom.*8. Further, if you consider the motive, it must be because God is displeased and offended, because sin is against an holy Law, and so of a staining and a polluting nature.

Lastly, if you consider the effect and fruit of repentance, it is an advised forsaking, and utter abandoning of all those lusts and iniquities, in whose fetters they were before chained: so that a man repenting and turned unto God, differs as much from himself once a sinner, as a *Lazarus* raised up and walking, differs from himself dead and putrifying in the grave. Do not thou

then whose heart is not contrite, who doest continually lick up the vomit of thy sin, promise to thy self repentance: No, thou art far from this duty as yet.

The second of the godly.

On the other side, there is a contrary mistake, and that is sometimes by the godly soul, and such as truly fear God, They think not repentance enough, unless it be enlarged to such a measure and quantity of sorrow: as also extended to such a space of time; and by this means, because they cannot tell when they have sorrowed enough, or when their hearts are broken as they should be, they are kept in perpetuall labyrinths, and often through impatience do with *Luther* in such a temptation, *wish they never had been made men, but any creatures rather*, because of the doubts, yea the hell they feel within themselves. Now although it be most profitable bitterly to bewail our sins, and to limit no time, yet a Christian is not to think pardon doth not belong to him, because his sorrow is not so great and sensible for sin as he desireth it. *David* indeed doth not only in his soul, but even bodily express many tears, yea rivers, because of his sin, and other mens sins; yet it is a good rule, That the people of God, if they have sorrow in the chiefest manner *appretiativè*, though not *intensivè*, by way of judgement and esteem, so that they had rather any affliction should befall them, then *to sin against God*; if this be in them, though they have not such *sensible intense affections*, they may be comforted. When the Apostle *John* makes this argument, *He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how shall he love God whom he hath not seen?* it implieth, that things of sense do more move us, then matter of faith. *David* made a bitter out-cry upon the death of *Absolom*, with sad expressions, *Would to God I had died for thee, O Absolom, my son, my son*, &c. But when *Nathan* told him of his *adultery* and *murder*, though he confessed his sin, yet we reade not that he made such sensible lamentation. Thus *Hierom* writeth of a godly woman *Paula*, that at the death of her children, would be so dejected, that she did hardly escape death; yet it is not reported that she found such grief for her sins. So that as in corporall things, a man would choose the tooth-ach, rather then a pestilent feaver, yet a man is more afflicted and pained at the tooth-ach, or burning of his finger, then

then at a feaver: So it may be here, a godly man would rather chooſe the loſs of his children, or deareſt relations, then loſe the favour of God by his ſinne; yet it may be have more painfull grief in the one then the other. Again, it is to be obſerved, that the Scripture requiring ſorrow or repentance for ſin, doth not limit ſuch a degree, or ſuch a length of time, which if neceſſary, would certainly have been preſcribed.

6. It cannot be denied, *but that the ancient Fathers have ſpoken hyperbolically of tears and repentance*; which phraſes were the occaſion of that corrupt doctrine in Popery. *Chryſoſtom* compareth repentance to the fire, which taketh away all ruſt of ſinne in us. *Baſil* cals it the medicine of the ſoul, yea thoſe things which God properly doth, are attributed to tears and ſorrow; as if the water of the eyes, were as ſatisfactory as the bloud of Chriſt; his bloud is clean enough to purge us, but our very tears need waſhing. It is true indeed, we reade of a promiſe made to thoſe, who turn from their evil waies, *Ezek.* 18. 27. he ſhall ſave his ſoul alive; but this is not the fruit of his repentance, but the gift of God, by promiſe: It qualifieth the ſubject, it hath no influence upon the priviledge: Even as a man doth by the power of nature diſpoſe and prepare the body to receive the ſoul, but it is the work of God, immediatly to infuſe it. Prop. 6.

7. *Though therefore repentance be neceſſary to qualifie the ſubject, yet we run into falſhood, when we make it a cauſe of pardon of ſin.* And thus ignorant and erroneous people do: Ask why they hope to be ſaved or juſtified, why they hope to have their ſins pardoned; they return this anſwer, becauſe they have repented, and becauſe they lead a godly life: thus they put their truſt and confidence in what they have done. But the Scripture, though it doth indiſpenſably command repentance in every one, yet the efficient cauſe of pardon is Gods grace, and the meritorious is Chriſts bloud: And if repentance come under the name of a cauſe, it can be only of the materiall, which doth qualifie the ſubject, but hath no influence into the mercy it ſelf. We reade *Luke* 7. that *Mary Magdalen* had many ſinnes pardoned her, becauſe ſhe loved much: But the Parable of a Creditour which forgave debts, that is brought by our Saviour to Prop. 7.

aggravate her kindness, doth plainly shew, that he speaks not of a love that was the cause of pardon of her sin, but which was the effect of it, Gods love melting her heart, even as the Sun doth snow. The highest expressions that we meet with in Scripture, where pardon of sin seemeth to be ascribed to godliness, as a cause, is *Dan* 4.27. *Break off thy iniquitiey by shewing mercy to the poor.* Here we would think, that if a man would on purpose hold, that doing of a good work, would be a proper cause to remove sin, he would use no other expression. But first it appeareth by the context that *Daniel* giveth not this counsell in reference to Justification, and the pardon of his sin, so as to be accepted with God; but to prolong and keep off that temporall judgement, which was revealed in the vision, as appeareth by those words *(if there may be a lengthening of thy tranquillity.)* And we have the like instance in *Ahab*, who prorogued his calamity by an externall humiliation. Again, although the vulgar translate it, *Redeem thy sins*; yet the Hebrew word doth properly signifie, *to break a thing*, as we translate it; and although by a metaphor it be applied to *redeem* and *deliver*, yet that is alwaies of men and persons, not things, especially it would be ridiculous to say, *Redeem thy sinnes:* so that the meaning is, that whereas before, *Nebuchadnezzar* had by injustice and oppression done much rapine and violence, now *Daniel* counselleth him to break off such wicked waies, by the contrary expressions of love and charity: so that this place giveth not any spirituall mercy to repentance, as the proper cause thereof.

Prop. 8. 8. As repentance is thus necessary, but not as a cause of pardon: so neither is it required, as that whereby we appease and satisfie God; and this all Popery goeth upon, yea and all Pharisaicall spirits, in their humiliation, that by those afflictions and debasements of their souls, they shall satisfie God, and make him amends. But this is so gross, that the more learned of the Papists are fain to mitigate the matter, and say, That satisfaction canot be properly made to God by any thing we do, because all we have and do is from God, and therefore there must be an acceptation or Covenant by way of gift interposed, whereby we may be able to satisfie. And then further they say,

There

There cannot be ſatisfaction made to gain the friendſhip of God, which ſin hath violated, but to take away ſomething of temporall puniſhment that belongs to ſin.

So that by all this which hath been delivered, we may give repentance thoſe juſt and true bounds, which Gods Word doth aſſign to it, and yet not give more then Gods Word doth. Neither may we think it a nicety or ſubtilty to make a difference between a qualification, and a cauſe; for if we do not, we take off the due glory that belongs to Chriſt and his merits, and give it to the works we do, and we do make Chriſt and his ſufferings imperfect and inſufficient; and by this we may ſee, in what ſenſe grace inherent, or ſanctification doth expell ſin; for if we ſpeak of the filth and pollution of ſin, ſo ſanctifying grace expels it, as light doth darkneſs, heat doth cold, by a reall mutation and change: So that God in ſanctifying doth no more to expell the ſin in the filth of it, afterwards; even as the Phyſitian needs to do no more to the removing of the leproſie, then by producing a ſound health in the body. But when we ſpeak of the guilt of ſin, it is not grace ſanctifying within us that doth remove the guilt, but grace juſtifying without us. Inſomuch that although a man after ſin committed were perfectly ſanctified, yet that would not take off the guilt his ſin had brought upon him: ſo that although that man needed in ſuch a caſe no further grace of ſanctification to make him holy, yet he needed the grace of remiſſion to take away this guilt. So that the guilt of ſin doth not ceaſe by a naturall neceſſity, upon the removing of the nature of the ſin, but upon a diſtinct and new act of Gods favour in forgiving; for if this were ſo, then Gods mercy in giving a repenting heart, and his mercy in pardoning ſhould not be two diſtinct mercies, (which yet are evidently diſtinguiſhed by the Scripture) but the ſame entire mercy. Now although this be true, yet how few do reform their judgements in this point? and thereupon they come to put that upon their grace within them, which belongs to grace without them.

The ſcope of the whole.

Uſe of Inſtruction, That there may be an happy reconciliation and accord between Gods grace in forgiving, and mans duty in repenting, one need not be preached to juſtle out the other. All errour is an extremity of ſome truth, and therefore it is

Uſe 1.

hard to discover truth, because its difficult to finde out where the bounds are that truth parts from errour. Let not therefore a Christian so rely upon his repentance, as if there were no Covenant of grace, no blood of Christ to procure an atonement: so neither let him extoll these causes to the extinguishing of his duties.

Use 2. To stir up to this duty of repentance, as that without which pardon of sin cannot be obtained. There is no such free-grace nor Gospel-mercy that doth supersede a broken and contrite heart. Christ was broken for thy sins, yet that will not excuse thee from a broken heart for them also. Christ was wounded, and a man of sorrow for thy sins, yet that will not take off thy wounds and sorrow also. Indeed if these were able to satisfie Gods wrath, or to make an attonement, then Christ was wounded, and became a man of sorrows in vain, for God doth not require a two-fold satisfaction: but we are wounded for sin upon other grounds then Christ was: we mourn for other causes then he did: and consider, thou that art afraid to grieve here for sin, how little is that which thou shalt be forced to grieve for it hereafter! Thou art unwilling to be burdened here; but oh how easie is that to the load thou must stand under hereafter! This *Bernard* urged, When, saith he, we urge men to repent, they say, This is *durus sermo*, an hard speech, who can bear it? but you are deceived; when God shall say, *Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire*, This is indeed an hard speech. And account that repentance is as much as the bringing of a man to his wits and minde again. All the while thy sins are not a burden to thee, thou art in blindness: even as the childe, as long as it is in the dark womb, weeps not, but as soon as ever it cometh into the light, then it crieth. As long as thou liest in the womb of darkness and ignorance, thou mourneſt not; but when God shall open thy eyes to see thy estate, and the aggravation of thy sins, then thou wilt burst out into sorrow.

Lect. XIX.

Repentance no cause of Pardon, and yet its Usefulnesse and Necessity as to Pardon. Why Repentance is not sufficient to remove the Guilt of Sinne; And why it bears not the proportion in Satisfaction that Sinne doth in the offence.

Matth. 6. 12.

And forgive us our Debts.

IT hath been shewed, That there is an happy accord between Gods grace in pardoning, and our duty in repenting. In bounding of which you have heard the Scripture excludes all merit and causality from our repentance, and gives the glory of all to Gods grace, and Christs bloud.

Before I leave this point, it will be necessary to answer some practical Objections, for there is a great miscarriage in many about this very duty of repentance. If they be asked, How they hope to be saved? they will reply, by their repentance. Thus they make that their ark, and city of refuge; they look upon that as the

Practical Objections concerning repentance.

the brazen Serpent, and not Jesus Christ. And it is no wonder if this be so among ignorant people, when the most learned amongst the Papists, do give such power and merit unto repentance. Insomuch that *Vasques* saith, *He wonders at those Catholicks who have such low and despicable thoughts of the righteousnesse in us, as that it should not exclude sin, without any new favour or pardon of God:* as if the enabling of us to repent, did expell the guilt of sin, as fire doth water, by a natural necessity.

Object. 1. Of what use repentance may be.

The first Objection therefore may be, *To what purpose doth God require repentance seeing it is no cause of pardon? Why may not God forgive sin, as well without this sorrow of ours? for if it have no efficacy of it self, to deliver from the guilt of sin, then sin might be pardoned as well without it as with it; for if the Spirit of God prepareth us for pardon, by exciting and stirring up repentance, this repentance must have some respect of causality to pardon, or else to what purpose is it wrought? it is hard therefore to see the necessity of repentance, unless it have such effects.* Insiste fortiter pœnitentiæ, inhære tanquam naufragus tabulæ, *said* Ambrose; *and this efficacy all are prone to give to repentance.*

Answ. 1.

Now to answer this, lay first this foundation, That God doth indispensably require repentance of all, *Act.* 17.30. where not only the command of repentance is made known, but the goodnesse of God in pressing this duty: for whereas God hath neglected and passed over the former times of ignorance, by not revealing any such command unto them, now by the general spreading of the Gospel he doth. For howsoever we translate it *(winked at)* as also *Beza* doth, yet *Dieu* upon the place sheweth more probably, that it signifieth *Gods anger*, and indignation to them, and therefore hid the meanes of salvation from them. This grace is also required of the godly sinning, 2 *Cor.*7.9,10. *Revel* 2.16. *Tertullian* subtilly, but not solidly saith, *God first didicated repentance in his own self; for before God said, It repenteth me that I have made man, the name of repentance was not heard.* But we know that God cannot in a proper sense be said to repent, because there is no *ignorance* in his understanding, or *mutability* in his will. But to answer, Why God doth require it; this in the first place might be enough, *Because it is his will and command, Bonum est pœnitere,*

annon,

annon? quid revolvis? Deus præcipit, said *Tertullian*, Is it good to repent, or not? Why doubteſt thou? Hath not God commanded it? It is Gods will to joyn pardon and repentance together. Though there were no more connexion between theſe two, then by that meer appointment of God, we were bound up to do it. As we ſee in the Sacraments, God hath promiſed ſuch ſpiritual grace in the holy uſe and application of ſuch outward ſigns, where there is no natural connexion at all between the grace and the ſign; but the union comes by the meer inſtitution and command of God. Although the conjoyning of pardon with repentance, be more then from a meer poſitive command, there is an *aptneſſe* and *fitneſſe* in the thing it ſelf. Now God in commanding of this, doth not becauſe he needed it, or as if he could not do otherwiſe; for if a man may forgive another that hath injured him, although he do not grieve or be troubled for ſuch an offence, why may not God, if we ſpeak of *abſolute* power? Thy tears therefore and thy repentance, they make not God more happy; neither are they required for *Gods good*, but for thy *own good*. Neither doth God require them, as if they ſhould make up any defect or inſufficiency in Chriſts bloud; for alas, if Chriſts bloud be not able to cleanſe away thy ſinne, how ſhall thy tears do it? Hence its no leſſe then blaſphemy, which *Rivet* reporteth of *Panigirolla* the Papiſt, who cals it *fooliſhneſſe*, and a grievous ſin to put confidence wholly in Chriſts bloud. Although therefore God puts up thy tears in his bottle, yet if he do not alſo take notice of the bloud of Chriſt, thy ſoul muſt ſtill remain filthy. Do not therefore magnifie thy tears, and undervalue Chriſts bloud. The bloud of the Sacrifice, which repreſented Chriſts bloud, was to be ſprinkled upon the poſts of the door, but not on the threſhold, it was not to be trampled upon or deſpiſed: no more is Chriſts bloud.

In the ſecond place, *There are many reaſons of congruity and fitneſſe, why a man ſhould repent, though it procure not pardon as a cauſe.* Though God cauſe the Sun to ſhine, and the rain to fall upon the wicked as well as the righteous, yet pardon and reconciliation is not vouchſafed to the *impenitent*, as well as the *penitent*. *Anſw. 2.* Six Reaſons of Congruity betwixt repentance and remiſſion.

Reas.1. The first reason of *congruity* is, *Because hereby a man shall experimentally know the bitternesse of sin, as well as the sweetnesse of it*; For as God, though Christ hath fully satisfied his Justice, to take away all punishment, doth yet heavily afflict his own people for sin, that so they may in their own sense apprehend what wormwood and gall is in sin; so the Lord, though pardon come wholly by Christ, yet will give it to none, but to those that repent, that so according to their delight in sin, may also be their bitternesse for it, *Jer.2.19.* *Aristotle* said, *Homo est magis sensus quam intellectus*, much more is he *sensus* then *facti*, more *sense* then *faith*; and what he experimentally doth most feel, in that he is most affected.

Reas.2. 2. Another congruity is this, *Hereby we shall come to prize pardon the more, and to esteem the grace of God in forgiving.* The sick esteem the Physician. The broken bones make a man cry out for ease. The famished Prodigal would be glad of crums. It is therefore fit that a mans sins should be a burden and an heavy trouble to him, that so pardon may be the sweeter, and Gods love the more welcome. When *Josephs* brethren were put in fear, and dealt with roughly as spies: after this to know that *Joseph* was their reconciled brother, did work the greater joy. Again, we shall hereby judge the better of Christs love to us, his sufferings in his soul were more exquisite then those in his body, when he cryed *My God, why hast thou forsaken me?* in this was the height of his agony. Now thou that in thy repentance feelest Gods displeasure, art ready to cry out, why dost thou forsake me? by these throbs and agonies in thy own soul, thou mayest have some scantling of what Christ had in his soul: and certainly to think that Christ was thus tempted, thus under Gods displeasure for thee, will more endear Christ to thee, then that he was made poor, a worm and no man, yea crucified for thee.

Reas.3. 3. *Hereby we shall give God the glory of his Justice, that he might damn us, if he did enter into strict judgement with us.* In repentance we judge our selves, *1 Cor.11.* that is, we condemn our selves, acknowledge such sins to be committed by us, for which God might shew no mercy, for which he might slay. *Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire*; and by this means, God is highly honoured, and we debased. See this notably in *David*,

Psal.

Psal. 51. 4. *Against thee have I sinned*, that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and clear when judgest. By this expression, *David* doth acknowledge, That all the afflictions laid upon him for sin, were just, and therefore God was to be cleared howsoever. Thus in repentance a man comes to know himself, how low and vile he is, and that if he be saved from wrath and hell, it is meerly from Gods good pleasure; and therefore repentance is a kinde of *revenge upon a mans self*, 2 *Cor.* 7. 10. The Lord is set up in his greatnes and soveraignty, we are made wholly prostrate.

4. As there is a Congruity, *So repentance floweth by natural consequence from a regenerated and sanctified heart.* For seeing regeneration is taking away the heart of stone, and giving an heart of flesh, thereby also is given a *flexiblenesse*, and *tenderness*, and *aptnesse to relent*, because God is dishonoured. As there is in children a natural impression to mourn and relent, when a father is displeased, so that this godly sorrow floweth from a gracious heart, as a stream from the fountain, as fruit from the tree. From this inward principle *David* doth so heartily mourn and pray; from this *Peter* goeth out, and weeps bitterly. It is therefore a vain Question to ask, Why a godly man is humbled for sin? It is as if you should ask, Why a childe mourneth for the death of his father? That love of God within him, which doth abundantly prevail, and reign there, is like fire that doth melt and soften. So that as natural forms are the principles of actions, which flow from them; Thus is a supernatural principle of grace within, the ground of all spiritual actions that issue thence from; but although it flow as a fruit, yet many times this stream is obstructed or dried up. *Reas.* 4.

5. There is *in godly sorrow an aptnesse or fitnesse to be made the means or way wherein pardon may be obtained.* And this is the highest our godly sorrow can attain unto, in reference to pardon of sin, *viz.* an *ordinability* of it to be such a way, wherein we may finde mercy. And thus we cannot say of impenitency, or any other sin: That God may forgive a man living in his impieties and wicked wayes, for they have no *aptitude* or *condecency* in their natures to be referred to such an end. We grant therefore that when the Spirit of God doth humble and soften a *Reas.* 5.

mans heart for ſin, that it works that in a man which hath a fitneſſe to be uſed as the means whereby mercy is obtained; yet that hath no merit or condignity in it to purchaſe ſalvation. Hence it is that we may not ſay, It is all one whether a man doth repent or not; or that repentance is in a man, as a *ſign* only that God hath pardoned; but we muſt go further and ſay, It is *the means and way* which God hath appointed antecedently to pardon; ſo that where this goeth before, the other cometh after.

The ſixt Reaſon two-fold: 1. In regard of Gods juſtice.

6. *There is a Congruency in repentance for ſin, though it be not expiatory or ſatisfactory; if we do regard the Juſtice of God, or the mercy and grace of God.* The Juſtice of God: For if he ſhould pardon ſinfull, impenitent men, though they wallow in all mire and filth that deſpiſe his grace and mercy, how could his Juſtice bear it? Though therefore repentance doth not ſatisfie his Juſtice, yet ſins unrepented of cannot be pardoned without injuſtice; and therefore Chriſt did not undertake to ſatisfie the wrath of God in an abſolute *illimited* manner, but in an *ordered* way, *viz.* in the way of faith and repentance.

2. In regard of his grace and mercy.

Again, *It is not beſeeming the grace of God, to give pardon without repentance, for hereby a flood-gate would be opened to all prophaneneſſe and impiety*; and then what ſenſe or taſte could men have of the grace of God, if it were thus expoſed to all impenitent, as well as repenting, who would *magnifie grace?* who would *deſire it?* So that you ſee, its neither agreeing with the mercy or the Juſtice of God, to forgive ſin before, or without repentance.

Object. 2. Whether repentance of it ſelf may not take away the guilt of ſin.

A ſecond Objection may be, *Why repentance wrought by the Spirit of God, is not enough to remove ſin in the guilt of it? What neceſſity is there, that beſides this there ſhould be a ſpecial and gracious act of God to pardon?*

Anſw. 1.

1. The Anſwer is from many grounds: Firſt, *The Scripture makes theſe two diſtinct mercies, and therefore ought not to be confounded.* God promiſeth to turn the heart unto him, and he will turn to it, in the way of pardon. So that a man abſolved at the throne of grace, hath two *diſtinct* benefits, for which he is to give God thanks; The one is, That he makes him to *ſee* his ſins, and be *humbled* for them; The other,

other, That being thus humbled, God giveth him *pardon*; for although God hath ordered it so, that where the one goeth before, the other shall infallibly follow, yet all this is of Gods goodnesse. He might have commanded repentance in a deep and broken manner, and when we had done all, yet might have had no pardon, and therefore its no thanks to thy repentance, but to Gods *grace*, that thou doest meet with forgivenesse.

2. *Our repentance is infirm and weak needing another repentance.* *Answ.* 2. *Lava Domine, lachrymas meas*, saith he, *O Lord, wash my tears.* That is only true of Christs bloud, which *Ambrose* spake in commendations of water, *Quæ lavas omnia, nec lavaris*, which washest all things, and art not washed thy self. So that repentance cannot be the *remedy* to lean upon, for alas, that needeth *another remedy*, which is the *bloud of Christ*. If therefore when asked, How dost thou hope to have thy sins pardoned? thou answer, Because thou repentest and humblest thy self for thy sins. It will be further demanded, But how dost thou hope to have *thy sins of thy repentance* taken away? Here all must necessarily be resolved into the *bloud of Christ*. Take heed then after sin of trusting in thy own sorrow. It is a most subtil sin, unlesse a man be much acquainted with the Gospel-way, and his own self-emptinesse, its impossible but that he should look upon his repentance, as that which maketh God amends.

3. If it were possible that *our repentance were perfect and* *Answ.* 3. *without spot, yet that could not take away the guilt of sin committed, because sinne is an infinite offence and dishonour to God, and therefore can never be made up by any man, though he should be made as holy as Angels.* For if man had committed one sin only, if the same man should presently be made perfectly holy; or if he had the holinesse of Angels and Saints communicated to him, all this could not take off the guilt of sin, neither would all that holinesse have as much satisfied God, as sinne displeased and dishonoured him. Hence God sent Christ into the world to make a reparation, and to bring a greater good, then sin could evil. Oh therefore how low must this lay thee in the dust, after sin committed! O Lord, could I repent to the highest degree, Could I bring the holinesse of men-

and Angels, it could not make up the breach ſin hath made upon me, What then ſhall I think of my ſelf, whoſe graces may be much perfected and bettered then they are?

Why repentance bears not the proportion in ſatisfaction that ſin does in the offence.

But you may ſay, *Why ſhould not repentance be as great a good, and as much honour God, as ſin is an evil?* For when you ſay, ſin hath an infinite evil in it; it is meant only *objective*, becauſe God againſt whom it is committed, is an *infinite God*; Now then if ſin be called *infinite*, becauſe it turneth from an *infinite God*, why ſhould not repentance be ſaid to be infinite, becauſe it turneth to *an infinite God*? This hath much puzzled ſome, and hath made them hold, That repentance hath as much *infinite worth* in it, becauſe of God, to whom a man is turned by it, as ſin hath infinite evil in it. But there is a vaſt difference, becauſe it is enough for ſin to have an infinite evil in it, becauſe the offence is done againſt an infinite God, and ſo the nature of an offence is according to the object againſt whom it is. As an offence againſt a King or Emperour is more then againſt a private man; ſo that ſtill offences are *more* or *leſſe* as the perſons againſt whom they are, be of *greater* or *leſſe* dignity; but now it is otherwiſe in good things that are done by way of Satisfaction, that ariſeth from the ſubject, not the object: as now repentance, though it be a turning to God, who is infinite, yet that cannot have infinite Satisfaction, becauſe the *Subject* which doth repent is *finite*: Therefore this cleareth the difficulty, offences ariſe according to the *object*, but Satisfaction encreaſeth according to the *Subject*. Hence it is, that Chriſt only could ſatisfie, becauſe he only was an infinite perſon. Otherwiſe if grace or holineſſe could have done it, Angels might have wrought our redemption. Beſides, our repentance and turning to God, cannot be as meritorious of good, as ſin is of puniſhment, becauſe of that true rule, *Malum meum, & pure malum eſt, & meum eſt: bonum meum, neque pure bonum eſt, neque meum eſt.* Our ſins are altogether, and only ſins, and they are truly ours; but our good things are neither purely *good* things, nor yet *ours*, but the gifts of God.

Object. 3. What harm to God in ſin.

The laſt Objection is, *Why ſhould there be ſuch preſſing of mourning and repenting for ſin, and that becauſe it is ſuch an offence to God? For ſeeing God is All-ſufficient and happy enough in himſelf,*

himself, our sins do not hurt him or make him miserable, no more then our graces adde to his happinesse, but as he is above our graces, so he is also above our sins: seeing therefore God is incapable of any injury from man, why should sin be such an offence?

Answ. By distinguishing Gods Attributes.

The Answer is easie, If you consider the *internal Attributes* of God, as Justice, Wisdom, Glory and happinesse: so God can have no losse or injury, for he is alwayes the same happy and immutable glorious God: but if you do consider the *external* good things that are due to him from men, as honour, praise, reverence, &c. These may be taken away from God by the perverse wils and lives of men, and so God have lesse of this external honour and glory then he hath. And although this external honour and reverence do not make to the internal happinesse of God, yet he is pleased with this, and commands it of men, and threatens to punish where it is denied him; and certainly we may not think the Scripture doth aggravate sin under this title, as an injury to him, as that which offends him, and is disobedience unto him, if so be there were not some *reality*. Besides, the *necessity* of Christs death by way of Satisfaction, doth necessarily argue, That sin is a real offence, and dishonour to him. And lastly, a sinner as much as lieth in him, deprives God of all his inward happinesse and glory; insomuch that if it were possible God would be made lesse happy by our sins. It is no *thanks* to a sinner that he is not, but it ariseth from his *infinite perfection* that he cannot.

Use 1. Let the first Use be, *To commend repentance unto us by the necessity of it, if ever we would have pardon.* God hath appointed no other way for thy healing. Never perswade thy self of the pardon of sin, where sin it self hath not been bitter to thee. Besides where godly sorrow is, there will be earnest prayer and heavenly ascensions of the soul unto God for his pardon. Hence *Zech.* 12. the spirit of *prayer* and *mourning* is put together, and *Rom* 8. Prayer and groans unutterable. As the fowls of the heaven were at first created out of the water; so do thy heavenly breathings after God, arise from thy humbled and broken soul. It is presumption to expect pardon for that sin, which hath not either actually or habitually been humbled for by thee. If a man should expect health and life, yet never eat or drink, would you

you not say, he tempted God, and was a murderer of himself? So if a man *hope* for pardon, and yet never *debase or loath himself* repenting of his sins, will you not say, he is a murderer of his soul? And be encouraged to it, because God hath annexed such a gracious promise to it. He might have filled thee with sorrow here and hereafter. It might be with thee, as the damned angels, who have neither the grace of repentance, nor the mercy of pardon.

Use 2. 2. *Not to trust in repentance, but after all thy humiliations still to depend only upon Christ.* Though Christ died, and was crucified, yet he did not lose his strength and efficacy. This was represented in that passage of Gods providence, *That a bone of his was not broken*; rely therefore upon Christ wounded for sin, not upon thy own heart that is wounded; use this, but trust only in Christ. Dependance upon Evangelical graces doth evacuate Christ, as well as confidence in the Law. A man may not only preach the Law, and the duties thereof, to the prejudice of Christs glory; but also the duties and graces of the Gospel. If a man relieth upon his repentance and believing, he maketh Justification and Salvation to be of works, though it be of faith; for he makes his faith a work, and gives that glory which belongs to Christ to his own repentance.

LECT.

Lect. XX.

Whether Pardon of Sinne be an Immanent or Tranſient act of God; And whether it be antecedent to our Faith and Repentance. The contrary proved, viz. That God doth not Juſtifie or Pardon us before we Believe and Repent.

Matth. 6. 12.

And forgive us our debts.

It hath already been demonſtrated at large, how God doth remit or forgive ſins. We come now to ſhew, *What kinde of act forgiveneſs of ſin is, and whether it be antecedent to our faith and repentance.* Both theſe Queſtions have a dependency one upon another; and therefore muſt be handled together. What kinde of act in God forgiveneſs of ſinne is.

The firſt doubt is, What kinde of act in God forgiveneſs of ſin is? Whether it be an Immanent act, in-dwelling and abiding in God; or Tranſient, working ſome reall effect and change upon the creature. Now in handling of this, I ſhall not trouble you with that perplex Queſtion ſo much vexed by the Schoolmen, *Whether a tranſient action be in the agent, or in the patient*, but lay down ſome differences between an *immanent*

Two Cautions concerning the workings of God.

1. There are no accidents in him.

action, and a *transient* action; only you must take notice, that we are in meer darkness, and not able to comprehend how God is said to act or work. For on the one side, we must not hold that there are any *accidents* in God; or that he can be a subject recipient of such, because of his most *pure and simple essence*; so that whatsoever is in God is God. And yet on the other side, the Scripture doth represent God doing and working such mercies and judgements as seemeth good to him. Only this some conclude of, wherein others with some probability dissent, that Gods *knowledge* and *will* is the cause of all things that are done; so that there is not an *executive* power besides them, whereby he doth this or that; As we see there is in man, though an Artificer wils such a thing to be done, yet that is not existent till he hath wrought it, but now God worketh all things by a meer command of his will, as appeareth *Gen.* 1. God said, *Let there be light, and there was light*; here was Gods will to have it so, no executing power distinct from that will. Therefore it is a sure truth, *De Deo etiam vera dicere periculosum est.* It is dangerous to assert things, though true, of God; and *Tunc dignè Deum æstimamus cum inæstimabilem dicimus*, then do we rightly esteem of him, when we judge him above our thoughts or esteem. We must not therefore apprehend of God, as having a new will to do a thing in time, which he had not from eternity (as *Vorstius* and others blaspheme) but his will was from all eternity, that such a thing be in time accomplished by his wisdom. As for example, in Creation, God did not then begin to have a will to create: but he had a will from all eternity, that the world should exist in time; and thus it is in Justification and Sanctification; not that these effects are from eternity, but Gods will is: And if you ask, Why, seeing Gods will to *create* or *justifie* is from *eternity*, *Creation* and *Justification* are not also from *eternity*? The answer is, because God is a *free agent*, and so his will is not a necessary cause of the thing, for then it would be immediately, as the Sun beams are necessarily as soon as the Sun is, but it is a voluntary principle, and so maketh the effect to be at the time he prescribeth. As if there were an Artificer or Carpenter, that could by his meer will cause an house to be reared up; he might will this to be done

2. No new will in him.

in

in such and such a year long after his will of it to be: So God when the world is made, when a sinner is justified, willed these things from all eternity, and when they come to have a being, these effects cause an extrinsecall denomination to be attributed to God, which was not before, as now he is a Creator, and was not before, now he justifieth, and did not before. *There is no change made in God, but the alteration is in the creature.* But of this more in its time. Let us come to give the differences between an immanent action, and a transient, and then we may easily see, which of these two Justification or Remission of sin is.

Differences between an immanent and transient action.

The first and proper difference is this, *An immanent action is that which abides in God, so that it works no reall effect without:* As when God doth meerly know or understand a thing; but a transient action is when a positive change is made thereby in a creature, as in Creation, *&c.* So that we may conclude of all Gods actions which do relate to believers, only *predestination* is an immanent act of God, and all the rest, Justification, Regeneration, Glorification, are transient acts; for predestination though it be an act of God choosing such an one to happinesse, yet it doth not work any reall change or positive effect in a man, unless we understand it *virtually*, for it is the cause of all those *transient actions* that are wrought in time. Howsoever, therefore Justification be called by some an immanent action, and so made to go before faith and repentance *, as if faith were only a declaration and signe of pardon of sinne from all eternity, yet that cannot be made good, as is to be shewed.

1. An immanent action produceth no outward effect.

* *Extra controversiam est, remissionem peccatorum, prout actus est in Deo immanens, antecedere nostram fidem & resipiscentiam.* Twiss. *vind. gr. pag.* 18.

A second difference floweth from the other, *An immanent action is from eternity, and the same with Gods essence, but a transient action is the same with the effect produced.* Hence the Orthodox maintain, That Gods decrees are the same with his nature. Hence when we speak of Gods willing such a thing, it is no more then his divine essence, with an habitude and respect to such objects; Gods decrees are no more then God decreeing, Gods will no more then God willing: otherwise the *simplicity* of Gods nature will be overthrown, and those *volitions* of God, will be *created entities*, and so must be created by other

2. An immanent action in God is from eternity.

new *volitions*, and so *in infinitum*, as *Spanheimius* well argueth, only the later part seemeth not to be strong or sufficient, because when man willeth, he doth not will that by a new volition, and so *in infinitum*; and why then would such a thing follow in God? Besides, its no such absurdity in the actings of the soul, to hold a progress *in infinitum*, thus farre, that it doth not determinately pitch or end at such an act. It is one thing to have things *distinguished* in God, and another thing for us to *conceive* distinctly of them. The former is false, the later is true and necessary. But with transient actions it is otherwise, they being the same with the effects produced, are in time; and this is a perpetuall mistake in the Antinomian, to confound Gods *decree* and *purpose* to justifie, with *Justification*; Gods *immanent* action from all *eternity*, with that *transient*, which is done in time. Whereas if they should do thus in matters of sanctification and glorification, it would be absurd to every mans experience, whereas indeed a man may as truly say, That his body is glorified from all eternity, as that his sins are forgiven from all eternity. And certainly, Scripture speaks for one as well as the other, when it saith, *Whom he hath justified, them he hath glorified.*

By these two differences, you may see, *That pardon of sin is a transient action*, and so Justification also, partly, because it leaveth a positive, reall effect upon a man justified; he that was in the state of hatred, is hereby in a state of love and friendship, he hath peace with God now, that once was at variance with him. Now when we say, There is a change made in a man by Justification, it is not meant of an inward, *absolute* and *physicall* one, such as is in sanctification, when of unholy we are made holy; but *morall* and *relative*, as when one is made a Magistrate, or husband and wife: partly, because this is done to us in time, whereas immanent actions were from all eternity, and therefore it would be absurd to pray for them, as it is ridiculous for a man to pray he may be predestinated or elected. Some indeed have spoken of predestination, as *actus continuus*, a continued act, and so with them it is good Divinity, *Si non sis praedestinatus, ora ut praedestinerus*, If thou beest not predestinated, pray that thou maiest be; but this is corrupt doctrine, and much opposeth

oppoſeth the Scripture, which doth frequently commend election from the *eternity* of it, that it was before the foundations of the world were laid; whereas now for pardon of ſinne, it is our duty to pray that God would *do* it for us. This being thus cleared, we come to anſwer the next Queſtion depending upon this, *viz.* Whether God doth juſtifie or forgive our ſins before we believe and repent? and our anſwer is negative, That God doth not: Although there are many who are pertinacious, that he doth; and ſo they make faith not an inſtrumentall cauſe to apply pardon, but only a perſwaſion that ſin is pardoned; and thus repentance ſhall not be a *condition* to qualifie the ſubject to obtain forgiveneſs, but a *ſign* to manifeſt that ſin is forgiven. This Queſtion is of great practicall concernment; and therefore to eſtabliſh you in the truth, conſider theſe Arguments.

Arguments proving our belief and repentance antecedents of Juſtification.

Argum. 1. 1. The Scripture ſpeaks of *a ſtate of wrath and condemnation, that all are in before they be juſtified or pardoned.* Therefore the believers ſins were not from all *eternity* forgiven; for if there were a time, *viz.* before his regeneration and converſion, that he was a childe of wrath, under the guilt and puniſhment of ſinne, then he could not be at the ſame time in the favour of God, and peace with him. Now the Scripture doth plentifully ſhew, That even believers before their regeneration are detained in ſuch bonds and chains of guilt and Gods diſpleaſure, *Eph.* 2. 1, 2, 3. There the Apoſtle ſpeaking to the converted *Epheſians*, telleth them of the wretched and curſed condition they were once in, and he reckons himſelf amongſt them, ſaying, *They were children of wrath, and that even as others were*: So that there is no difference between a godly man unconverted, and a wicked man, for that preſent ſtate; for both are under the power of Satan, both walk in diſobedience, both are workers of iniquity, and ſo both are children of wrath. It is true, the godly man is predeſtinated, and ſo ſhall be brought out of this ſtate, and the other left in it. But predeſtination (as is more largely to be ſhewed) being an immanent act in God, doth denote no poſitive effect for the preſent of love upon the perſon; and therefore he being not juſtified, hath his ſins imputed to him, lying upon him, and therefore by the Pſalmiſts

argument, not a blessed man. This also, 1 *Cor.*6.9,10,11. The Apostle saith of some *Corinthians*, that they were such as abiding in that state could not inherit the Kingdom of God, *and such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are justified.* Therefore there was a time when these *Corinthians* were not justified, but had their sins abiding on them. Likewise all the places of Scripture, which speak of Gods wrath upon wicked men, and that they have no peace with God, must needs be true of all godly men while unconverted. *He that believeth not, hath not life, and the wrath of God abideth on him; and without faith it is impossible to please God.* Now who can deny but that this is true of *Paul*, while no believer, but an opposer of godliness? The *Psalmist* also saith, *God is angry with the wicked every day*: Was not this true of *Manasses* before his conversion? It must therefore be a very poysonous doctrine, to say, That God is as well pleased with a man before his conversion as after.

*Argum.*2. 2. *If the Scriptures limit this priviledge of Justification and pardon only to those subjects that are so and so qualified, then till they be thus furnished, they cannot enjoy those priviledges.* The places are many which testifie this, *Act.*3.19. *Repent, that your sins may be blotted out.* Therefore their sins stood uncancelled, as so many debts in Gods register book, till they did repent, *Act.*26.18. *To turn them from darkness to light, from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins.* Therefore they had it not, while under the power of darkness, 1 *Joh.* 1.9. *If we confess our sins, he is faithfull and just to forgive us our sins*, which supposeth, That God doth forgive our sins only, when we confess and forsake them, *Matth.*6.15. *If ye forgive not, neither will my heavenly Father forgive you.* It is in vain to number up more places, for these do necessarily prove sin is not forgiven, till faith and repentance. They do not indeed argue a causality or merit, yet they inferre a necessary presence in those that obtain pardon, and do hold by the same proportion, as those places which require sanctification before glorification.

3. Where the Scripture requireth *many things to the obtaining of any speciall benefit, there that benefit cannot be said to be enjoyed, till all those things be brought about.* Now the Word of God speaks

speaks of severall things required to pardon of sin. There is the *grace and mercy of God*, as the *efficient cause*, Psal.51.1. Isa. 43.25. *Rom.*3.25. 2. There is requisite *the blood of Christ*, as the *meritorious cause*; for there can be no remission of sins without effusion of bloud, *Rom.* 3.25. 1 *Cor.*15.3. *Heb.*1.3. 1 *Joh.*4.10. 3. There is *faith* required as an *instrumentall cause*, *Act.*26.18. *Rom.*3.25. Now although an instrumentall cause have not that worth or excellency as the efficient and meritorious have, yet it is *as necessary* in the way of an *instrument*, as the others are in their respective causalities: so that as a man may not from those places which speak of Gods grace, inferre, Therefore remission of sins is before Christs death: So neither may a man argue, because Christ died to take away our sins, Therefore these are taken away before we believe. So that this argument may fully establish us. We see the Scripture speaking of three causes cooperant to pardon of sin, therefore I may not conclude the effect is wrought till all those causes be. And as the Scripture speaks of these causes, so, as you heard, of many qualifications in the subject. Insomuch that it is so farre from being a duty to believe our sins were pardoned from all eternity *antecedently* to faith and repentance, that we are undoubtedly to believe they were not. If the King proclaim a pardon to every one that shall humble himself and seek it out. If the Physitian prepare a potion for the patient to receive it, shall any man say, because of those causall preparations, that either the one is pardoned, or the other healed before their particular application of those things?

Arg.4. 4. *If our sins be pardoned antecedently to our faith and repentance, then all those effects which are inseparable in the least moment of time from Justification, are also antecedent to our faith and repentance:* But it is evident by experience that is not so. It is a clear truth, That sanctification of our natures is individually conjoyned one with the other. So that although there be a priority of nature, yet they are together in time. God pardons no mans sins whom he doth not heal, *Rom.*8.1. 1 *Joh.*1.9. *Psal.* 32.2. A man may be justified, and not glorified, but not justified and unregenerated. Then if so, a man shall be at the same time, unconverted and converted; at the same time a member

of

of Christ, and a member of the devil; and so as they say, we are justified only declaratively in our own consciences, so we shall be regenerated and converted only declaratively. Again where sins are pardoned, there is blessedness, as the Psalmist speaks, then I may call *Paul* a blessed persecutor; *Manasses* a blessed murderer, for they had no sin imputed to them at that time. Besides, those whose sins are pardoned, may boldly go to the throne of grace, and call God Father; all which are contrary to the whole tenour of Scripture, which expostulateth with men, for taking his name or words into their mouth, and hate to be reformed: yet a Doctor of this Antinomian sowr leaven, affirmeth * boldly, *That God doth love us as well before conversion, as after; That God did love Paul with as great a love when he persecuted the Church, as when he preached the Gospel:* How must this devour up all godliness, when I may have the same faith and confidence in God for pardon in the acting of flagitious crimes, as well as out of them, in praier and humiliation? and if he may have the same faith, why not then the same consolations, and joy in conscience?

* *Den* Reconc. with God. *pag.* 25.

*Arg.*5. 5. *If Justification do antecede our faith, so that faith doth only declare our pardon of sin, then any other grace may be said to justifie as well as faith.* For take any other grace, repentance, humility, joy, these are all the fruits of Gods Spirit, and so demonstrate his election of us, his Justification of us. But how unanswerably do the Orthodox prove, a peculiar instrumentall vertue in faith for pardon, which others have not? The Apostle expresseth it, διὰ πίστεως, *through faith in his blood*, not love of his blood: and indeed the Apostle maintaineth that Gospel position against false teachers, *viz.* That we are justified by faith, not by works. The Question was not, Whether the works of the Law did justifie us declaratively only, but causally. So then by this Doctrine, faith must no more be called the hand, or the eating and drinking of Christs body and blood, but only made a sign of such mercies.

*Arg.*6. 6. *If pardon of sin be from all eternity, going before our faith and repentance, because of Gods election, then it must also be antecedent to the death and obedience of Christ.* So that not only our tears, but Christs blood shall be excluded from this great favour. The reason

reason is plain, Because Gods predestination and election is antecedent to Christ, yea Christ is a fruit of our election: so that the Orthodox maintain against Arminians, Though we be chosen in Christ, yet not for Christ. Christ is the meritorious cause of Justification and Glorification, but not of predestination, that is meerly from his own self; so that if Gods act of predestinating us be enough to instate us into all this favour and love, what need is there of an atonement by Christs blood? and thus we may urge a Doctors Argument upon himself. All the elect of God are justified, but all the elect of God are elected antecedently to Christs merits, Therefore they are justified before Christs merits.

Den Arg. 3. to prove we are justified before we believe.

7. *If (because its said,* Ephes. 2. *That while we were dead, Christ gave himself for us, and* Rom. 5. *That he died for the ungodly,)* it followeth *our sins are pardoned before we believe, then is will also follow, that all mens sins are pardoned.* For the Texts that speak thus of his dying for the ungodly, and for enemies, make no distinction of one from another: And thus a *Judas* as well as a *Peter* is bound to believe his sinnes are pardoned. Those that argue against all qualifications, and say, God requireth nothing of thee, though lying in thy blood, must needs hold an universall promiscuous pardon of all, and that such a sin as presumption is not possible, For if I believe that Christ died to take away my sins, though I walk in all disobedience, yet that is not presumption, but a duty. It is true, the Orthodox call upon those who lie groveling in their swinish lusts to come unto Christ, and to believe in him; but what is that faith? Not a faith that sinnes are already pardoned, but a faith relying on him for pardon, which faith also at the same time cleanseth and purifieth the heart. Therefore let us take those generall Texts, which speak of Christs dying to take away the sinnes of enemies; and let any Antinomian give a true reason, why one mans sinne is pardoned rather then anothers: And although to evade this, they fall into another errour, holding Christ died for all; yet that will not serve the turn, unlesse they hold, That all men shall actually be saved and none damned; for those Texts speak of a benefit that is actually obtained for those, in whose behalf

Arg. 7.

he died. And thus I have produced seven Arguments for the antecedency of our faith and repentance to our Justification, as many in number, as the forequoted Authour brings against it. Other grounds may be pleaded to this purpose, when we shall demonstrate, that all sins are not pardoned together.

Use. Use of Exhortation, to avoid all presumption, whether it be wrought in thee by thy own carnall heart, or corrupt teachers, and that is, when thou believest pardon any other way then in Scripture bounds; there is a Pharisaicall presumption or Popish; and there is an Antinomian or Publican presumption. The former is, when we hope for pardon, partly by Christ, and partly by our own works and merits. The other is, when we expect it, though living and walking in sin. Now it is hard to say, whether of these is more derogatory to Christ. The one sinnes in the excess, the other in the defect. Be not therefore a Pharisee, excluding Christ either in whole or in part from the cause of pardon, *Tutius vivimus, quando totum Deo damus*; we live more safely, when we give all unto God, and take nothing unto our selves. In the next place be not a Publican: Think not to have Christ and Belial together; expect not pardon for sinne without repentance of it. The world is filled with these two kinde of presumers: some limit Gods grace, and associate their performances with it. Others extend it too farre, and conjoyn their lusts with it. But as the Apostle saith, If of works, and of the Law, then there is no grace: so we may, If of lusts, and prophane impieties, then there is also no grace. We are therefore both to avoid sins, and carnall confidence in our own righteousnesse, if we would have Christ all in all. In vain did *Peter* and *Mary Magdalen* pour out their souls with so much bitternesse, if pardon of sinne may be had without this. It is *Hieroms* observation, That in all *Pauls* salutation, grace goeth before peace, for till Gods grace hath pardoned our sins, we can have no peace, and God doth not pardon but where he gives repentance. Labour therefore for that which is indeed the good of thy soul, *viz.* pardon of sinne. When the rich man in the Parable, speaking of the corn in his barne, said,

said, *Soul, take thine ease, thou hast much good laid up for thee,* He spake as if he had *porcinam animam*, the soul or life of an hog; for what good is corn and wine to a mans soul? Forgivenesse of sin and reconciliation with God; that is, the connatural and suitable good and happinesse for the soul.

LECT. XXI.

The Antinomian Arguments for Justification before Faith, answered.

MATTH. 6. 12.

And forgive us our Debts.

IT hath been proved, That God doth not justifie or pardon a man till he doth believe, and that the wrath of God abideth upon such an one. It is necessary in the next place to answer those Objections which are propounded by the Adversaries, because some of them carry a specious pretence with them. And indeed the Antinomian with those Arguments he fetcheth from some places of Scripture, is like *David* in *Sauls* armour, not able to improve them, the weapons being too big for him. But before I enter into the conflict, its worth the enquiry, what the judgement of the Orthodox is in this point.

The *Remonstrants* (*Acta Synod.* p. 293.) bring several places out of our Authors, *Lubertus*, *Smoutius*, *Piscator*, and others, wherein they expressly say, *That God doth blot out our sins before we either believe or amend our lives, and that this pardon doth antecede our knowledge of God, faith, conversion, or regeneration of the*

heart. Thus also Dr *Twiss*, in the place before quoted. *Pemble* also to this purpose (*pag.* 24) *The Elect* (saith he) *while unconverted, they are taken actually justified, and freed from all sin by the death of Christ; and so God esteems of them as free, and having accepted of that Satisfaction, is actually reconciled to them.* But the falshood of this will appear in answer to the sixth Argument. When *Grotius* had distinguished of a twofold remission, a full remission, and a lesse full remission, holding this later kinde of remission to be given to impenitent sinners, abusing two places of Scripture for this purpose, *Rom.* 5.10.2 *Cor.* 5.19. *Rivet* confuteth him, making it a sure truth, *That sins are not actually remitted, but to those that repent*, and saith, *Quinam sunt ii, qui volunt actu remissa peccata cuiquam ante conversionem? certè nobis sunt ignoti. Who are they that say, Sins are actually pardoned before Conversion? Certainly they are unknown to us. Although we acknowledge the price of Reconciliation and Redemption to have been prepared for the Elect from all eternity, or in Gods purpose and intention remission of sins to have been ordained for them, even at Conversion, which in his time, by Gods grace are to be effected.* Thus *Rivet. Vindic Apol. p.*127. If therefore any of our orthodox Authors have acknowledged a remission of sins before faith, it hath been in a particular sense to oppose the Arminians, who maintain a reconciliability, and not a reconciliation by Christs death, and not in an Antinomian sense, as is more largely to be shewed in answering of their Objection brought from Christs death for enemies and sinners. Indeed some learned and worthy men speak of a Justification before faith in Christ our head, as we are accounted sinners in the first *Adam* or common person. Thus *Alstedius* in his supplement to *Chamier*, *pag.*204. When *Bellarmine* arguing against the holinesse of the Protestants Doctrine, and bringing this for a paradox above all paradoxes, *That I must be justified by faith, and yet justifying faith be a believing that I am just and righteous; which is*, saith *Bellarmine* besides and against all reason. He answereth among other things, That Christ and the Elect are as one person, and therefore an elect man is justified before faith in Christ, as the principle of righteousnesse before God; and then he is justified by faith as an instrument, perceiving his

Justification

Justification in that righteousnesse of Christ. So that faith as it goeth to the act of Justification, is considered in respect of that passive application, whereby a man applieth the righteousnesse of Christ to himself, not of that active application whereby God applieth to man the righteousnesse of Christ: For this application is in the minde of God.

To this purpose the learned *Zanchy* in his Explication of the second Chapter of the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, upon those words, *vers.* 5. [*And you being dead in sinne, he hath quickened together with Christ*.] doth in the first place distinguish of a twofold quickning, one whereby we are freed from the guilt of sinne, and invested with a title or right to eternal life; The other from the power of sin, whereby we are made spiritually alive to God. The former is Justification, the later Sanctification. Now, saith he, this twofold blessing is to be considered in Christ, and in our own persons. In the first respect, God did quicken us in Christ, when by his death (sin being expiated) he freed from guilt all the elect that have been and shall be, considering them as members in Christ their head. In the later respect God doth it, when having given us faith, he gives us also remission of sins, and imputeth Christs righteousnesse to us. And afterwards the fore-quoted Author, making this Objection to himself, How Christ could be said to be freed from the guilt of sin, who had no sin? He answereth, The person of Christ is considered two wayes; first in it self, as God-man, and so Christ was not bound by any guilt. Secondly, as appointed head, and so representing our persons. In this respect, as God *laid our iniquities upon him* Isa. 55. So when they were expiated by his bloud, then was he released from the guilt of those sins. We might instance in other Authours, but these may suffice to certifie, that some orthodox and learned Divines do hold a Justification of the Elect in Christ their head, before they do believe, yet so, as they acknowledge also a necessity of a personal Justification by faith, applying this righteousnesse to the person justified. Therefore although this Doctrine passe for true, yet it will not strengthen the Antinomists. Although even the truth of this opinion may modestly be questioned, unlesse by being justified in Christ our head, we mean no more

then that Christ purchased by way of Satisfaction our Justification for us, and so virtually we were justified in Christs death and Resurrection. But the learned men of that opinion, speak as if God then passed a formal Justification upon all (though afterwards to be applied) that are elected; even as in *Adam* sinning all his posterity were formally to be accounted sinners.

Reasons against Justification in Christ before faith.

Now this may justly admit a debate, and there seem to be many Arguments against it.

First, *If there were such a formal Justification, then all the elect were made blessed and happy, their sins were not imputed to them: for so in Adam when accounted sinners, they are wretched and miserable, because sin is laid to their charge.* And if the elect before they believe or repent were thus happy, how then at the same time could they be children of wrath? and so God imputing their sins to them, Can God impute their sins to them, and not impute them to them at the same time? It is true, if we say, That Christ by his sufferings obtained at Gods hand, that in time the elect should believe and be justified, this is easily to be conceived; but it is very difficult to understand, how that all our sins should be at the same time done away in Christ (who is considered as one person with us) and yet imputed to us.

Reas. 2. Secondly, *I do not see how this Doctrine doth make our Justification by faith to be any more then declarative, or a Justification in our conscience only, and not before God, and so by believing our sins should be blotted out in our sense only, when they were blotted out before God by Christs death already.* And so our Justification by faith, shall be but a copy fetcht out of the Court-roll, where the sentence of Justification was passed already, whereas the Scripture speaks to this purpose, That even before God, and in his account, till we do believe and repent, our sins are charged upon us, and they are not cancelled or blotted out, till God work those graces in us. Therefore this opinion may symbolize too much with the Adversary; and indeed none of the meaneſt Antinomians * speaks of an original reconciliation which was wrought by Christ on the Crosse, without any previous conditions in us, and urgeth that parallel of the first *Adam*, in whom we all sinned before we had any actual being; as also that Text *Col.* 3. 1. where we are said *to be risen with Christ.*

* *Den* Reconc. of man with God, p. 3, 4.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, *It is difficult to conceive, how Christ should represent us to his Father, thereby to partake of the heavenly blessings which come by him, till they do actually believe, and are incorporated in him. For they are no members till they do believe: and till they are his members, he cannot as an head represent them.* Reas. 3.

It is true, God knoweth whom he hath elected, and to whom in time he will give faith, whereby they may be united to Christ, and so its in Gods purpose and intention to give Justification and Sanctification to all his elect. But these being mercies vouchsafed in time, and limited to such qualifications in the subject, I see not how they can be said to be justified in Christ (before they do believe) otherwise then virtually and meritoriously. It is true, we are all condemned in *Adam*, because that was a Covenant made with him and his posterity, so that the issues thereof fell upon them by a natural and necessary way: But it is not so in the second *Adam*. Neither do those places *Ephes.* 2. 5, 6. *Col.* 2. 13, 14. prove any more, then that *in* and *through* him, we do obtain such mercies there spoken of: and although we are said *to sit in heavenly places* already, yet that is because of the certain right we have thereunto; in which sense also, *He that believeth is said to have eternal life*; and Christ being the *first fruits* doth sanctifie the whole lump.

As for that place, 1 *Tim.* 3. where Christ is said to be *justified in the spirit*, that makes nothing at all to the Justification we speak of. For the meaning is, That Christ was declared just, and absolved from all the reproaches cast upon him, by the Spirit of God, which was done several wayes; as by the witnesse exhibited from heaven unto him, by the innumerable miracles he wrought. In which sense, *Mat.* 11. *Wisdom* is said *to be justified of her children*. So that *Act.* 2. 22. seemeth to be a full Commentary on this place, *Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by signs and wonders, which God did by him in the midst of you*. And this is that Justification of himself, which Christ speaks of, *Isa.* 50. 8. It is true, the Apostle doth apply that spoken of Christ to every believer, *Rom.* 8. by way of allusion: and the rather, because Christ being the head of the elect, it will be made good of them in time, when they do believe; otherwise

wise election is not enough to free from present accusation or condemnation, unless by faith they be actually in Christ, as is to be shewed more at large.

But this is a digression. It is the constant opinion of the Orthodox, That a man is not justified, or hath his sins pardoned, till he doth believe. I have brought Arguments to prove the point, and now addresse my self to remove their Objections.

1. Argument from Infants.

The first is brought from Infants, *who are justified, and yet do not believe, therefore before faith some are justified.*

Answ. 1. First, The case of Infants is of peculiar consideration, and therefore not to be attended unto in most Questions: yea the Scripture pressing the things requisite to salvation, as repentance, obedience, *&c.* cannot be understood of Infants. And *Suarez* argueth against Justification by faith in the general upon this ground, *Because Infants are justified without it.* So that the Argument (if it proveth any thing) would prove a Justification without faith, rather then before faith. Suppose a man should argue about Glorification, as the Adversary doth about Justification. Infants are glorified without fruits meet for repentance, Therefore men grown up also may be, How absurd would that be? Therefore if the conclusion of the Argument were granted, *viz.* Some that do not believe are justified, restraining it to Infants, the main Question would have no detriment. The Opponent layeth down this conclusion [*Reconc. of man with God, p.* 5.] That mans actual reconciliation to God, requireth previous conditions to be wrought in him by Gods Spirit before he can be reconciled actually to God, among which he reckoneth believing as the chief. Now I may retort on him thus, Infants are actually reconciled to God: But Infants do not believe: Therefore some are actually reconciled to God that do not believe.

2. Secondly, The Opponent cannot but know that there are learned men, who hold Infants have actual faith, and do believe, Therefore to them his Argument is of no force. It may very well be thought, that they have actual sins, not such as are in men grown up, accompanied with reason and will, but those immediate motions of original corruption in them. For although original sin be not *peccatum actuale*, yet it is *peccatum actuosum*,

actuosum, if it be not an actual sin, yet it is an active sin, and therefore may not be thought idle in an Infant. *Austin. lib.* 1. *confes. c.* 2. *Vidi ego Zelantem parvulum, &c. I have observed envy in an Infant, when another little childe hath sucked his breſt*, and ſo they have ſinfull anger, which made the ſame Father ſay, *Imbecillitas membrorum infantilium innocens eſt, non animus infantum, There is more innocency in their bodies, then in their ſouls.* Now if there be actual motions of ſin before the uſe of reaſon, why not actual motions of Gods Spirit? That it is poſſible, *John* Baptiſt makes it without queſtion: all the doubt is, Whether God doth ordinarily ſo to Infants. *Aretius* is alledged by ſome to hold, *That* * *even repentance may be attributed to Infants*, out of *Joel* 2. 16. but the command there is, That parents ſhould bring their children into the publick humiliation, that by the ſight of them they may be the more fervently ſtirred up to pour out their prayers before God.

Thirdly, That which the moſt ſolid Divines pitch upon, is, *That Infants have* (I ſpeak not generally, but indefinitely) *a ſeed of faith, becauſe they have the Spirit of God and regeneration, otherwayes they could not be ſaved; and by this ſeed of faith, they become members of Chriſt, and that relation which is in their faith to Chriſts merits, is the inſtrument by which they obtain remiſſion of ſinne.* As for that place, *Faith cometh by hearing*, it is to be applied to the ordinary means of faith, and that in perſons grown up. Neither can I ſay, that an Infant is bound to have actual faith; for happily in the ſtate of Integrity, Infants then, though they had the Image of God, yet could not have put forth the actual exerciſe of graces, and if they could not do it in that ſtate, it is not to be expected they do ſo now.

Fourthly, It is not enough for him to prove they are juſtified before they beleeve, but alſo before they be any way united to Chriſt, let that union be conceived how it can by us. For if a man be juſtified, becauſe he is elected, as his third Argument would prove; then he is to ſhew, that Infants not only before they beleeve, but before they have any union with Chriſt are juſtified, for the election of Infants muſt needs go before their union with Chriſt. And howſoever the opponent quoteth *Auſtin*,

* Neither may this ſeem ſuch a wonder, ſeeing that the orthodox hold even in men grown up, the firſt grace is wrought in us as meer patients, our underſtandings and wils no wayes antecedently concurring to it; ſo that the grace of God is then wrought in us, without us.

3.

4.

ſaying, That which was wrought in *John* Baptiſt, to be a ſingular mercy, yet (*Serm.* 14. *de verbis Apoſtoli*) on thoſe words, *He that believeth not ſhall be damned*, makes this Queſtion, *Ubi ponis parvulos baptizatos?* Where put you little children baptized? *Profecto in numero credentium*, Truly in the number of believers.

Argum. 2. His ſecond Argument is to this effect, *He that is in Chriſt is juſtified. Now a man is in Chriſt before he doth believe, becauſe the tree muſt be good before the fruit can be. Therefore a man muſt be juſtified before he do believe.*

In anſwering this Argument many things are conſiderable,

Anſw. 1. Firſt, It muſt be acknowledged a very hard task to ſet down the true order of the benefits beſtowed upon us by God. The aſſigning of the priority and poſteriority of them is very various, according to the ſeveral judgements of men intereſſed in that controverſie.

The Opponent (it may be knoweth) that there are ſome, who ſay, Chriſt or the Spirit of Chriſt is firſt in us by way of a moving or preparing principle, and afterwards as a principle inhabiting and dwelling in us; That as ſome ſay, *Anima fabricat ſibi domicilium*, The ſoul makes its body to lodge in; it works firſt efficiently, that afterwards it may formally, ſo they ſay, Chriſt doth in us. As the ſilkworm prepareth thoſe ſilken lodgings for her ſelf to reſt in. So that according to the judgement of theſe men, Chriſt, or his Spirit, doth efficiently work in us the act of believing, by which act Chriſt is received to dwell in us. And in this way, Chriſt hath no union with us, till we do believe. He worketh indeed in us before, but not as united to us. Now according to this opinion, the anſwer were eaſie, That we are not in Chriſt till we do believe; Though Chriſt be in us, as working in us, and upon us. Yea faith would firſt be wrought, and then Chriſt with his benefits of Juſtification, *&c.* would be vouchſafed to us; but there are reaſons why it is not ſafe to go this way. And indeed that *Charta magna*, or grand promiſe for regeneration, doth evidently argue the habits or internal principles of grace, are before the actions of grace, *Ezek.* 36.26. God takes away the heart of ſtone, and giveth a

new

new heart, an heart of flesh, which is the principle of grace, and afterwards causeth them to walk in his Commandments, which is the effect of grace.

But secondly (which doth fully answer the Objection) It 2.
is true, our being ingrafted into Christ, is the root and fountain of faith, and of Justification too; but yet so, that these being correlates (Faith and Justification) they both flow from the root together, though with this order, that faith is to be conceived in order of nature before Justification, that being the instrument to receive it, though both be together in time. Therefore the *major* Propositon should be thus regulated, He that is in Christ doth believe, and is justified, or believing is justified; for Justification as our Glorification, though it flow from Christ, yet it is in that order and time which God hath appointed. Neither is it any new thing in Philosophy, to say, Those causes which produce an effect, though they be in time together, yet are mutually before one another in order of nature in divers respects to their severall causalities.

Christ is in us, and we in Christ, Christ is in us, δοτικῶς, by way of gift, and actual working, and we are *in Christ* λειπτικῶς, by way of receiving; and both these are necessary, as appeareth *John* 15.5 and both are together in time, yet so that in order of nature, Christs being in us is before our being in him, and the ground of all our comfort and fruit, is not because we are in him, but he in us (even as the branch beareth fruit, not because it is in the Vine, but because the Vine is in it, communicating efficacy to it) Thus also Faith and Justification are together, yet so as one is produced by the other; we are not justified, and therefore believe, but we believe and are therefore justified.

Lastly, This may be retorted upon the Opponent, who (as 3.
was alledged before) denieth any actual reconciliation, till we do beleeve. But may not we strike the adversary with his own reason in this manner? He that is in Christ is actually reconciled. But we must be in Christ before we do believe. Therefore we must be actually reconciled, before we do believe.

I passe over the third, and reserve the fourth and sixth Argument (being all one) for the next Lecture, because in them is matter worthy of a large consideration.

Arg. 5. I come therefore to the fifth Argument, which is taken from the collation between the first *Adam* and second, out of *Rom.* 5. 18, 19. From whence is argued, *As in the first Adam we are accounted sinners before any thing done on our part; so in the second Adam, we are to be justified before any thing wrought in us.* This the Opponent doth much triumph in, but without cause, as the answer will manifest.

Answ. And in the first place we cannot but reject those Expositors of that Text fore-quoted, who understand us to be *sinners in Adam*, only by *imitation*, or by *propagation* meerly, as from a corrupted fountain; but we suppose it to be by imputation: *Adam* (by Gods Covenant) being an universall person, and so as *Austin* said, *Omnes ille unus homo fuerunt*, All were that one man. And therefore these do not rise up to the full scope of the Text, who parallel Christ and *Adam* only as two roots, *Origens*, or *Fountains*; for there must be a further consideration of them, as two common persons, for our immediate fathers are a corrupted root, and we are corrupted by them, yet their sins are not made ours, as *Adams* was. Hence the Apostle layeth the whole transgression upon one, *As by one mans disobedience*, &c. Those that deny imputation of *Adams* sinne (as the *Pelagians* of old, and *Erasmus* with others of late) do not relish that Translation of those words, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, *in whom all have sinned*, but preferre the other, *Forasmuch as all have sinned in him*; but both come to the same sense: and howsoever *Erasmus* say, that ἐν with a Dative case must be understood causally, yet that is not universally true; for *Mar.* 2. 4. There is mention made of the Bed, ἐφ' ᾧ in which the Paralytique lay, it would be ridiculous to translate that, *Inasmuch*. So *Acts* 2. *Be baptized*, ἐν ὀνόματι, *in the Name*, Heb. 9. Those Ordinances consisted ἐν βρώμασι, *in meats*. We therefore grant, That *Adams* sinne was ours by imputation, before we had any actual consent to it. In which sense *Bernard* called it, *Alienum & nostrum*, anothers sinne and ours: yea, it is so farre from being ours by consent, that if a man on purpose

purpoſe ſhould now will that *Adams* ſinne ſhould be his, this would not make *Adams* ſinne imputed to him, it would be a new actual ſinne in the man, it would not be *Adams* ſin imputed to him. Now although all this be concluded upon, yet it followeth not, that therefore we are juſtified in Chriſt before we beleeve. I acknowledge, ſome eminent Divines have preſſed this compariſon; but there is a vaſt difference in this very act of Imputation, and the ground of it; for ſuppoſing the Covenant at firſt made with *Adam*, all his poſterity by a natural way are involved in his guilt, and ſo whether they will or no, antecedently to their own acts they are obnoxious to this guilt Hence all men (none excepted) that are propagated in a natural way are thus corrupted, but in Chriſt we are by a ſupernatural way, and none are made his, but ſuch as beleeve in him; and he doth not repreſent any to God as his members, till they be incorporated into him by faith, which faith although it be a gift of God, yet by it we are enabled voluntarily to chooſe and embrace Chriſt. Many other differences there are, but I pitch on this only, as being fully to my purpoſe in hand. If therefore we were in Chriſt by a natural way, as we are in *Adam*, then antecedently to any thing wrought in us, we might be partakers of priviledges by one, as we are of curſes by another.

LECT.

Lect. XXII.

More Arguments to prove Juſtification before Faith, Anſwered.

MATTH. 6. 12.

And forgive us our debts.

WE proceed to the remaining Arguments, which would maintain a Juſtification before faith.

Arg.7. The next is from Gods election, thus, *All the elect of God are juſtified before God. But ſome of the elect do not believe.* And the *major* is proved from *Rom.*8.33. *Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? It is God that juſtifieth.*

Anſw.1. In the firſt place this Argument might eaſily be laid aſide, for the Apoſtle doth not ſpeak here of election *antecedenter*, antecedently to his other graces, which flow from that in time, but *executivè*, as it is executed and compleated in thoſe that are elected. Therefore by the elect he meaneth thoſe elect that believe, that are holy, that are conformable to the image of God, that do love him, as the context ſheweth; for otherwiſe we know *Paul* himſelf laid much to the charge of the *Epheſians*, though elect, when before their converſion, he ſaid they were *children of wrath as well as others*; and therefore by that adamantine chain, *Whom he hath predeſtinated he hath called, whom he hath called he hath juſtified, whom he hath juſtified he hath glorified*, it is plain, he takes election *terminativè* (as they ſay) in the effects of it, even till it hath obtained the utmoſt *terminus*, which is everlaſting glory.

2. From

2. From this chain alſo is an infallible Argument againſt the Opponent, thus, *Anſw.* 2.

Thoſe only are juſtified that are called. But none are called or converted from all eternity, Therefore none are juſtified from all eternity.

The *major* is grounded upon the method and order which the Apoſtle obſerveth, beginning with the higheſt round in that chain, which is *predeſtination*, and ending in the loweſt, which is *glorification*: ſo that it cannot rationally be thought that the Apoſtle did not intend an exact order and method in thoſe expreſſions.

3. *If ſo be a man (becauſe he is elected) be juſtified from all eternity, then it will alſo follow he is glorified from all eternity.* And ſo *Hymeneus* and *Philetus* may be excuſed in this ſenſe, if they ſay, The reſurrection is paſt already. It is true, the Apoſtle uſeth words ſignifying time paſt, Whom he hath predeſtinated, he hath called, *&c.* but that is either to ſhew the certainty and infallible connexion of theſe benefits together; or elſe, becauſe predeſtination being neceſſarily for the time paſt, he would not alter the current of his expreſſion for the following mercies. *Anſw.* 3.

4. The Apoſtle might well ſay, *Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect?* and not of *believers*, becauſe election is the *materiall mercy*, it is the *fountain and head* from which all other flow. Hence the Apoſtle doth in the ſame Chapter limit mercies to thoſe that are called according to Gods purpoſe, implying hereby, that this is the ground and root of all. *Anſw.* 4.

But fifthly, To diſcover the fundamentall weakneſs of this Argument. We are to take notice, *That predeſtination is an immanent act of God, and works no poſitive reall effect upon the party elected, till in time: for howſoever it be an act of love, yet of love only by way of purpoſe and decreeing, and ſo doth not denote a change in the creature, but when that purpoſe or counſell of God (which is altogether free) hath determined it.* Hence we are to conceive a love of God electing us from all eternity, which doth produce another love of God (not immanent in him, for ſo nothing is new in God, but tranſient in us) and that is Juſtification; from this love floweth another effect of love, which *Anſw.* 5.

which is glorification. Some have doubted, Whether election be an act of love, and therefore have diſtinguiſhed between dilection and election, as if dilection did go before, and election follow. But certainly the ſame act of God, as it doth will good to the creature, is dilection; as it willeth it to this rather then another, is election. We grant therefore that Election is an act of great love, but its a love of purpoſe or intention, not execution, it is *amor ordinativus*, not *collativus*; its a love ordaining and preparing of mercies, but not beſtowing them preſently. Thus *Auſtin* defined Predeſtination, to be *Præparatio beneficiorum quibus liberantur*, a preparing or ordaining of thoſe mercies and priviledges, which the elect ſhall have in time. And among men we ſee the purpoſe of giving ſuch a gift is accounted love, as well as the gift it ſelf. Now while a man is only under the love of election, and no more, there is no actuall remiſſion of ſin, no acceptance or complacency in his perſon or duties. There is a purpoſe in God to do all theſe in time, but the mercies are not from eternity exhibited. So that in ſome reſpects there is a great difference between an *elect perſon unconverted*, and a *reprobate*: And again in ſome reſpects there is none at all. As for example, there is this grand difference, That although both be equally in ſin, and under wrath, yet God hath a purpoſe to bring the elect perſon infallibly out of that miſery; and in this reſpect God may be ſaid never to hate him that is elect, (In which ſenſe God is ſaid to love *Jacob* and hate *Eſau*) but the reprobate ſhall periſh eternally in his ſin. The Apoſtle ſaith, *Rom.* 11. Election hath obtained, becauſe that will moſt certainly bring about both the means and the end. So that for all the elect, *The foundation of God ſtandeth ſure, having this ſeal, The Lord knoweth who are his, 2 Tim.* 2.19.

An elect perſon unconverted, and a reprobate in many things differ not. As

1.

2. There is no difference in this, in that for the preſent both are children of wrath, both aliens from the promiſe of grace, no promiſe of any gracious priviledge either for pardon of ſin, or eternall glory belongs unto them, only Gods purpoſe will in time make an actuall difference between them. Neither is this to make any contradictory will in God, for both theſe may well ſtand together, *viz.* Gods will for the future to give pardon

2.

and

and glory; and yet to will neither of them to be for the present. All this is done with the same act of Gods will. If therefore hatred be taken as opposite to that love of election which God had from all eternity, so an elect man, though unregenerate, is never hated; but if it be taken largely for that displicency or wrath of God, which is contrary to the grace of Justification exhibited in time, so he may be said to be hated before his conversion: neither is it any wonder, if this be called hatred, seeing in the Scripture, less loving, is called hating sometimes, as the Learned observe. Neither doth this make any change in God, it only denoteth a change in the creature, as hereafter is to be shewed. So that the gross mistake, as if election were all love, actually and expressly, and the confounding of the love of God, as an immanent act in him, with the effects of this love, hath made severall persons split upon rocks of errours. But how love and anger are in God, is more exactly to be examined, when we speak of the meritorious cause of Justification, which is Christs merits: for indeed this Argument from election, will as well put in for a Justification before any consideration of Christ, as well as of faith, if every thing be duly weighed, as in that part (God willing) is to be shewed, where also the distinctions about Gods love are to be considered of. Some making a generall love, and a speciall love; others a first love and a second, or one flowing from the first, others a love of benevolence or beneficence, and of complacency: but of these in their proper place.

We proceed, and in the next place we will put his fourth and sixth Argument together, being both grounded upon this, *That Christ by his death gave a full satisfaction to God, and God accepted of it, whereby Christ is said so often to take away our sinnes, and we to be cleansed by his blood.* This Argument made the Learned *Pemble*, pag. 25. to hold out Justification in Gods sight long before we were born, as being then purchased by Christs death, otherwise he thinks we must with the Arminians say, Christ by his death made God *placabilem*, reconcilable, not *placatum*, reconciled. *No* (saith he) *it is otherwise, the ransom demanded is paid and accepted, full satisfaction to the Divine justice is given and taken, all the sinnes of* *Arg.* 4, and *Arg.* 6.

the elect, all actually pardoned. This is a great oversight.

Answ. 1. For first, Though Christ did lay down a price, and the Father accept of it, yet *both agreed in a way and order wherein the benefit should become theirs, who are partakers of it,* and that is, when they believe and repent. Now *bonum ex integra causa,* if God the Fathers Covenant be to give pardon for Christs sake to those that do believe (which faith also is the fruit of Christs death) then may we not separate Christ from faith, no more then faith from Christ, or God the Fathers love from both. If Christ had died for such a man to have his sinnes pardoned, whether he had faith in him or no, then this Argument would have stood-firm: God then did accept of Christs death, and becomes reconciled, but in that order and way which he hath appointed.

Answ. 2. 2. This Argument doth *interfere with that of election*; for there pardon of sinne doth take its rise from election, but here from the time God laid our sins upon Christ. And indeed the Antinomians are at a variance amongst themselves, some fetching the originall of pardon from one way, and some from another.

Answ. 3. 3. We do not say, That faith is the condition of Christs acquiring pardon, but of the application of pardon. Faith doth not make Christs merits to be merits, or his satisfaction to be satisfaction. This ariseth from the dignity and worth of Christ. It would be an absurd thing to say, That faith is the cause why God doth accept of Christs merits, and receiveth a satisfaction by him. This were to make the *instrumentall* cause, a *meritorious* cause. The Arminians they make Christ to have purchased pardon upon condition of believing, which believing they do not make a benefit by Christs death; yea they say, *Nihil inepitius, nihil vanius,* nothing is more fooliish and vain then to do so. Now this indeed is an execrable errour, to hold Christ died only to make a way for reconciliation, which reconciliation is wholly suspended upon a mans faith, and that faith comes partly from a *mans will,* and partly from *grace,* not being the fruit of Christs death, as well as remission of sins it self. But we say a farre different thing, Christ satisfied Gods wrath, so that God becomes reconciled, and gives pardon, but in the

method

method and way he hath appointed, which is faith, and this faith God will certainly work in his due time, that so there may be an instrument to receive this pardon.

For the opening of this, when it is said, Christ satisfied Gods wrath, this may have a different meaning, either that Christ absolutely purchased reconciliation with the Father, whether they believe or no, without any condition at all, as *Joab* obtained *Absolons* reconciliation with *David*, or *Esther* the Jews deliverance of *Ahashuerosh*, or with a condition. In the former sense it cannot be said, because the fruits of Christs death are limited only to believers. If with a condition, then either antecedent, which is to be wrought by us, that so we may be partakers of his death, and that cannot be, because its said, *He died for us while sinners and enemies.* And this is Arminianism, for by this means only a gate is set open for salvation, but it may happen that no man may enter in, or else this condition is concomitant or consequent, *viz. A qualification wrought by the Spirit of Christ, whereby we are enabled to receive of those benefits, which come by his death:* And in this sense it is a truth; and by this the foundation of the Opponent is totally razed. For Christ took away the sinnes of those for whom he died, and reconciled them to God, and this absolutely, if by it we understand any condition anteceding to be done by us, but not absolutely, if it exclude a condition that is consequently wrought by the Spirit of God, to apply the fruits of Christs death: so that the actuall taking away of sins is not accomplished, till the person for whom he died be united to him by faith. Hence the Scripture speaks differently about Christs death; sometimes it saith, *He died for us sinners and enemies*; and in other places, *Joh.* 15. 13. *He laieth down his life for his friends, and his sheep* Joh. 17. 19. *He saith, he praieth and sanctifieth himself for those that shall believe in him*, viz. in a *consequent* sense, for those who by faith shall lay hold on his death. So that faith hath a two-fold condition, the first of the time when sins are taken away by Christs death, and that is when they beleeve. Secondly, Of whom these priviledges are true, and that is, of such who do beleeve. Now all this may be the further cleared, if we consider, what kinde of cause Christs death is to take away our sins. It is a meritorious

A two-fold condition of faith.

cause, which is in the rank of morall causes; of which the rule is not true, *Posita causâ, sequitur effectus*, the cause being, the effect presently followeth. This holdeth in naturall causes, which necessarily produce their effects, but *morall* causes work according to the agreement and liberty of the *persons* that are moved thereby. As for example, God the Father is moved through the death of Christ to pardon the sins of such persons, for whom he dieth. This agreement is to be made good, in that time they shall pitch upon in their transaction. Now it pleased the Father, that the benefits and fruits of Christs death should be applyed unto the beleever, and not till he did beleeve, though this faith be at the same time also a gift of God through Christ. It is good therefore when we either call election absolute, or say, Christ died absolutely, to consider that *absolute* may be taken as opposite to a *prerequisite condition* which is to be fulfilled by us, so that upon this, election, and the fruits of Christs death shall depend: or else absolute, may be taken, as it opposeth *any means* or *order* which God hath *appointed*, as the way to obtain the end; and in this later sense, it would be a grand absurdity to say, Election is absolute, or Christ died absolutely; for if this were so, the prophane argument about election, would have truth in it; If I be elected, let me live never so wickedly, I shall be saved. And the Arminian Argument, That every one were bound to beleeve that Christ died for him, though wicked and abiding so, would not well be avoided.

Arg. ult. His last Argument is from the unchangeableness of Gods love, if we are not justified in his sight before we beleeve, then God did *once hate us*, and *afterwards love us*. And if this be so, why should Arminians be blamed, for saying, *We may be the children of God to day, and the children of the devil to morrow?* Hence he concludes it, as undoubted, that God loved us first, before we beleeve, even when we were in our blood.

In answering of this Argument, severall things are considerable,

Answ. First, It must be readily granted, That God is unchangeable, *Jam.* 1. 17. God is there compared to the Sun, and is therefore

fore called the Father of lights, but yet is preferred before it, because that hath clouds sometimes cast over it, and sometimes is in eclipse, but there is no change or shadow of change with him. The Heathens have confessed this, and so argued, If God should change, it would be either for better or worse; for worse, how could it be imagined? for better, Then God were not absolutely perfect. Most accursed therefore must *Vorstius* his blasphemy be, who purposely pleads for mutability in God.

But secondly, As this is easily to be confessed, so the difficulty of those Arguments, brought from the things which God doth in time, and not from all eternity, have been very weighty upon some mens shoulders; insomuch that they thought this the only way to salve all, by saying, *That all things were from eternity*. And certainly by the Antinomian Arguments we may as well plead for the creation of all things from all eternity, as that we are justified from all eternity, for all are equally built upon this sandy foundation, That because the things are done in time, therefore there must be some new act of will or love in God, which would imply God is mutable, not loving to day, and loving to morrow; Therefore to avoid this, they say, All is from eternity. *Origen* who was called by an ancient Writer *Centaure*, because of his monstrous opinions, argued thus, *lib. 1. de ἀρχῶν, cap. 2.* As there cannot be a Father without a sonne, or a Master and Lord without a possession, so neither an omnipotent, unless there be those things about which this power may be exercised. Now although it be true, That *de Deo etiam vera dicere periculosum est*, because of the weakness of our understandings to perceive his infinite lustre,

Yet thirdly, It is well cleared by the Schoolmen, That those relations which are attributed to God in time, as a Creator, Father or Lord, are not because of any new thing in God, but in respect of the creatures; so that when the world is created, when a man is justified, we say, God who was not a Creator before, is a Creator, who was not a Father by grace, is now by grace; not because any new accident is in him, but because there is a new effect in the creatures. Thus, if a man once the

childe of wrath, be now a ſon of Gods love, the change is not in God, but in the creature.

For the better clearing of this, we are to take notice in the fourth place, That it is one thing, as *Aquinas* obſerveth, *Mutare voluntatem*, to change the will; and another thing, *Velle mutationem*, to will a change. By the ſame unchangeable will we may will ſeverall changes in an object. As the Phyſitian, without any change of his will, may will his patient to take one kinde of phyſick one day, and another the third: here he wils a change, but doth not change his will. Thus God with the ſame will, decreed to permit in time ſuch an elect man to be in a ſtate of ſin, under the power of Satan, and afterwards to call him out of this condition, to juſtifie his perſon; here indeed is a great change made in the man, but none at all in God. There is no new act in God, which was not from all eternity, though every effect of this love of God was not from eternity, but in time. Hence when our Divines argue againſt Arminians, *That if the Saints ſhould apoſtatize, Gods love would be changeable*, it is meant of Gods love of *Election*, which is an abſolute purpoſe and efficacious will to bring ſuch a man to glory: now although ſuch a decree was free, and ſo might not have been, yet *ex hypotheſi*, ſuppoſing God hath made this decree, it doth very truly follow, *That if that Saint ſhould not be brought to glory, God would be changeable.* And beſides this immutability, which may be called an immutability of his nature, there is another of his Word and Promiſe, whereby he hath graciouſly covenanted to *put his fear in their heart, that they ſhall never depart from him*: now if any of the Saints ſhould totally or finally apoſtatize, Gods mutability would be ſeen in both thoſe reſpects of his *nature or will*, and of his *truth and fidelity*. But the caſe is not the like, when a man at his firſt converſion is made of a childe of wrath, a childe of grace; partly becauſe there was no ſuch abſolute decree of God from eternity, that he ſhould be for no ſpace a childe of wrath, but the clean contrary; and partly becauſe there is no ſuch word or promiſe unto any unconverted perſon, that he ſhall be in the favour of God; but the Scripture declareth the clean contrary. This duly conſidered, will give a clear reaſon, why it is no good argument

gument to ſay, ſuch a man in his ſins to day, is a childe of wrath, and converted to morrow, is a ſon of grace: Therefore God is changeable. But on the other ſide, if a man ſhould argue, An elect man received into the ſtate of grace, *may fall totally and finally, Therefore God is changed*, would be a ſtrong and undeniable inference. And indeed for this particular may the Arminians be challenged, as holding Gods mutability, becauſe they hold, That notwithſtanding Gods decree and purpoſe to ſave ſuch a man, yet a man by his own corruption and default, ſhall fruſtrate God of this his intention. Otherwiſe all know, *Adam* was created in a ſtate of Gods favour, and quickly Apoſtatized into the contrary: ſo that we may truly ſay, *Adam* was one day, (yea hour, as ſome) a childe of Gods favour, and in another of his wrath; yet the change was in *Adam*, not in God, both becauſe God had not made an abſolute decree from all eternity for his ſtanding, as alſo becauſe he had made no promiſe to preſerve him in that happy condition. In this ſenſe, 1 *Pet.* 2 10. it is ſaid, *Which in time paſt were not a people, but now are the people of God; which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.* And whereas the Opponent ſaith, God loved us before we did believe; it is true, with a love of purpoſe; but many effects of his love are not exhibited till we do beleeve. He loveth us, and ſo worketh one effect of love in us, that that effect may be a qualification for a new and further effect of love. He loveth us, to make us his friends, and when he hath done that, he loveth us with a love of friendſhip. God loved us before he gave Chriſt, for out of that love he gave us Chriſt, that ſo when Chriſt is given us, he may beſtow another love upon us. Now becauſe it is ordinary with us to call the effect of love, Love, as the fruit of grace is Grace; Therefore we ſay, *In ſuch a time God loved not one*, and afterwards we ſay, *He doth love the ſame*, not that herein is any change of God, but ſeverall effects of his love are exhibited. As we call the effects of Gods anger, his anger, *Pœna patientis ira eſſe creditur decernentis*, the puniſhment on the offender is judged the anger of the inflicter: and by this means we ſay ſometimes God is angry, and afterwards he ceaſeth to be angry, when he removeth theſe effects of his anger: ſo a man is

ſaid

said to be loved, or not to be loved, according to the effects of Gods love exhibited in time and God hath so appointed it, that one effect of his love should be a qualification in the subject for another, as Sanctification for Glorification.

Lect. XXIII.

Whether we pray here for Pardon, or for Assurance of Pardon onely. Why God sometimes pardons a Sinner, and doth not acquaint him with it; With Directions to doubting, tempted People, concerning their sinnes.

Mat. 6. 12.

And forgive us our Debts.

THe next Question to be considered is, *Whether in this prayer we pray only for the assurance of pardon, not pardon it self?* For thus the *Antinomians* answer to the Objection fetched from this place, *That the whole sense of this Petition is, That we may feel in our selves, and assuredly perceive, what pardon God had given us before.* Honey-comb. p. 153. So *Den Reconcil. of God to man,* p. 44. making this Argument of the Text against himself. If we

pray

pray for forgiveneſſe of ſins, then ſins are not forgiven before, anſwereth, *The Proteſtants* (ſaith he) *with one conſent hold, that they do beg at the hands of God greater certainty and aſſurance of pardon*, and he inſtanceth in a condemned perſon that is upon the ladder, who having received the pardon of his Prince, may when called into the Kings preſence, fall down and ſay, *Pardon me my Lord and King*; But this is to abuſe Proteſtant Authors: For although many of them may make this *part* of the meaning, yet none make it the *only* meaning. *Gomarus* in his explication of this Petition, doth excellently confute *Piſcator*, for explicating pardon of ſin by a metonymy of the ſubject, *viz The ſenſe and feeling of this in our hearts*, and ſaith, *That ſuch a ſignification cannot be proved out of any place of Scripture, nor out of the language of any good Authors*; and one of his reaſons is this; *Prayer for pardon of ſinne would be imprudently taken out of the Lords-prayer; for he who prayeth for the ſenſe and feeling of a thing, ſuppoſeth it already done. Now* (ſaith he) *every wiſe Petition hath for its object a thing to come, and not a thing paſt.*

This alſo *Bellarmine* objecting againſt ſpecial faith, as if it were a confidence that my ſins are forgiven already, he makes it as abſurd upon this ground to beg for pardon, as it would be to pray, that Chriſt may be incarnated, or made fleſh. *Crocius* in his anſwer to this, *Diſput. de fidei Juſtificantis objecto*, p. 131. ſaith, as you heard before, *That thoſe things indeed uſe not to be prayed for, which are ſo done, that they are never done more; but thoſe things which are ſo done, as that they may be often done again, may be prayed for. The Incarnation of Chriſt was once done, and can be no more, but remiſſion of ſins is ſo done, that it continueth further to be done, and its laſt effect is reſerved for the future. For as often as we ſin, ſo often there is need of repentance.* So that by his judgement remiſſion of ſin is not like creation, which once was, and is not reiterated, but conſervation. More might be ſaid out of Authors; but I come to anſwer the Queſtion.

Firſt, *We grant it a duty for that believer, who knoweth his ſins are pardoned, to pray for further faith and aſſurance of the pardon.* For ſeeing our faith admits of degrees, and is ſometimes ſtaggering, ready to ſink, no marvel if it needs ſupports. Thus *David*, although he heard his pardon proclaimed, yet makes

that penitential Pfalm, *Pſal.* 51. for mercy to do away his ſins, which was by appeaſing his conſcience, and ſatisfying his ſoul with the goodneſſe of God: For as a godly man, though he have truly repented of his ſins, yet upon any ſad occaſion doth reiterate his pardon, as *Paul* many times hath his heart-ake for his former blaſphemies and perſecutions; ſo it is neceſſary to have the ſenſe and apprehenſion of his pardon reiterated to his own comfort and conſolation. There is no mans aſſurance about pardon ſo high and unmovable, but it many times meeteth with violent aſſaults, and therefore needeth oyl to be frequently poured into his wounds, *Comfort, comfort ye my people* (ſaith the Prophet) There muſt be an ingemination of the duty, elſe the ſoul at firſt will not hearken.

2. This Petition relates to four ſorts of men.

In the ſecond place, We may conceive of four ſorts of perſons praying for this pardon of ſin.

The firſt is *an unconverted and unregenerated man.* For although he cannot call God Father, and ſo not pray in faith, yet he is bound to pray. The *Socinians* interpret that compellation, *Our Father*, not actually, but diſpoſitively; as if the meaning were, who art ready and willing to be a Father. But that is not the full meaning of that place. There lieth an obligation upon *unregenerate men* to perform holy duties, though they cannot do them acceptably. Their impotency to do them doth not diſoblige from the command to do them. Now its plain, that ſuch a perſon praying for forgiveneſſe, doth not pray for the aſſurance of that which is already paſt (for ſo no ſinne is forgiven to him) but for initial pardon, which he never yet hath enjoyed.

The ſecond ſort of perſons praying this prayer, are *thoſe that at the firſt converſion humble themſelves, and ſeek unto God for his face and reconciliation with him.* Now thoſe that are thus in their beginnings, and new birth, they can pray in no other ſenſe, but for initial and firſt pardon; for as that is the firſt time they begin to have ſorrow and brokenneſſe of heart: ſo that is the firſt time they begin to partake of pardon; pardon of ſinne and faith they are correlates, and ſo are together.

A third rank is of *Believers in their progreſſe of holineſſe and ſancti-*

sanctification, walking without any scandal or offence in the wayes of God. They, in this Petition, have a twofold sense, the one an assurance of the pardon of sins that are already forgiven them; and the other is a renewed pardon for the renewed infirmities they continually are plunged into.

Lastly, *There are lapsed believers, who have fallen into some grievous sins, and thereby have made desperate wounds upon their own souls, and these have agonies and pangs of heart, much like their first conversion.* Therefore its called so, *When thou art converted strengthen thy brother,* saith Christ to *Peter.* This recovery out of the sin they were plunged into, was like a new conversion. By such a commotion as this made in the soul, there is nothing but darkness and confusion, and they pray for pardon, as if this were the first time. They fear all their former wayes to have been hypocrisies. Thus *David,* Psal. 51. prayeth *for the restoring of joy to him, that his broken bones may be healed; as also for truth in the inward parts.* Now although such a mans former sins were indeed forgiven him, yet it is to his sense and feeling as if it were not so, but rather the contrary is feared by him, that Gods wrath doth still abide on him. Hence he prayeth for pardon in his own judgement, as one who yet never hath been acquitted by God. So that according to the several conditions of the persons praying, we may suppose several senses in the Petition:

But in the third place, to answer the Question, we say, *That assurance of pardon is not the only thing prayed for.* And that for these Reasons,

3. Assurance of pardon not the only thing prayed for, proved by four Reasons.

First, *We are never to depart from the literal sense of the words, without an evident necessity, but the plain undoubted sense is, That God would forgive our sins; For our Saviour minding brevity in this Prayer, no doubt would speak his sense in the most perspicuous and clear manner that can be.* As therefore if Christ had said, Make us to be assured of the pardon of sin, The Antinomian would not have gone from the letter, but pressed us to that; So on the other side, when Christ saith, *Forgive us,* and not Give us the sense of forgiveness, we have cause to cleave fully to that: and this may be illustrated by two further considerations: the former, of those places where God is said *not to*

Reas. 1.

forgive, the later of those where forgiveneſſe is applied of one man unto another. When the Prophet *Iſaiah* ſpeaking of the *Iſraelites*, how their Land was full of Idols, and both great and mean men did humble themſelves before them, *Iſa.*2.9 prayeth that therefore God would not forgive them, Can any one make the meaning to be, that God would not give them the aſſurance of their forgiveneſſe?

*Mat.*12.32. The Evangeliſt ſaith, *All other ſins may be forgiven, but that againſt the holy Ghoſt ſhall never*: Now in that ſenſe, other ſins are ſaid to be forgiven, in which ſenſe that is denied to be forgiven: and that is denied to be forgiven, not in reſpect of aſſurance and declaration to a mans conſcience only, but really and indeed. Therefore the ſins forgiven are in the like manner forgiven.

*Reaſ.*2. Again, It is plain, *That by pardon is not meant aſſurance of pardon only, becauſe when applied to men it cannot admit of ſuch a ſenſe.* Now the Petition runs thus, *That God would forgive us, as we forgive others*; and there is no man will explain the later forgiveneſſe of aſſurance; and why then the former?

*Reaſ.*3. Beſides; *The equivalent phraſe of forgiveneſſe doth evince more then an aſſurance of forgiveneſſe*: For when the Scripture cals it blotting out of ſin, its an expreſſion from debts, which are, as it were written in Gods book, and therefore till he cancelleth them, they do remain in their guilt.

*Reaſ.*4. Furthermore, *If a ſin be not really pardoned, till a man do repent and believe, then he beggeth for more then aſſurance*; But we have fully proved, That there is no remiſſion of ſin, till confeſſion and forſaking of it.

The inſtance for the contrary opinion anſwered. As for the above-named Authors inſtance of a malefactour who hath received pardon, may yet upon his coming into the Kings preſence, deſire pardon, it no wayes advantageth him: For ſuppoſe a malefactour might the firſt time do ſo, yet experience doth demonſtrate it would argue folly and madneſſe in a malefactour, to do ſo frequently: whereas it is our duty daily to beg the pardon of our ſins at the throne of grace. To conclude this point (becauſe we have elſwhere ſpoken to it). This Expoſition doth overthrow the continual uſe of the Word, the equipollent phraſes, the proper object of prayer; and departs from

from the letter of the Text, without any just ground at all. Which is against the rules of explication of the Scripture.

The next Question is of great practical concernment, *viz. Why God doth sometimes pardon a sin, and yet not manifest it to the sinners heart? It appeareth by* David, *Psal.* 51. *that when a sin is forgiven in heaven, it is not also remitted, and blotted out in a mans conscience; yet God can as easily work the one as the other. If he say, Let there be light in such a dark heart; of an hell, it presently becomes an heaven. We would judge that by this divine dispensation, as the godly man loseth much of his comfort, so God of his glory and honour.* Why God doth sometimes pardon sin, not acquainting the sinner with it.

But divers Reasons may be produced for this. As

First, It may be God will teach us hereby, *That pardon of sin is not a necessary effect of repentance, but a gracious gift bestowed, though not without it, yet not for it.* Though therefore thy soul hath been deeply humbled, and is greatly reformed, yet God suspends the light of his favour upon thy soul, that thou maist acknowledge it his grace, not the merit of thy sorrow; where causes do naturally produce an effect, there it is a miracle, if the one followeth not the other. If the fire do not burn, if the Sun stand still; if *Peter* walking on the water sink not. But it is no wonder, to see a true contrite heart without assurance and consolation. These may be separated, that so thou mayest be as humble with thy graces, as if they were not at all. Yea God hath delighted sometimes in natural causes to work the effects without them, lest the glory should be given to the instruments. Hence he caused light to be before the Sun, and the earth is commanded to bring forth herbs before any rain, that so God may be acknowledged all in all. If God do this in the order of natural things, how much more of supernatural? Yet this is not so to be prest, as if therefore God would forgive sin without repentance. No, God hath ordered a way inviolably and indispensably, wherein he will vouchsafe his pardon, and no otherwayes. But although God out of his *meer good will* hath *inseparably conjoyned repentance and remission together*, yet the *discovery* or *promulgation* of this unto the broken and contrite heart, is altogether arbitrary: And in this, as well as in other things, that speech is true, *The winde bloweth where it listeth.* *Reas.* 1.

liſteth. Know therefore by theſe divine diſpenſations, That though thou doſt repent, Gods forgiveneſſe is a meer gift of liberality, and no natural, neceſſary fruit of thy ſorrow. Inſomuch that ſetting Gods gracious promiſe aſide, whereby he is a debtor unto his own faithfulneſſe, after thy pureſt and moſt perfect humiliation for ſin, God might refuſe to take thy guilt away.

Reaſ.2. A ſecond Reaſon, Why God though he pardon, may yet deny the manifeſtation of it, is, *Becauſe hereby God would make us feel the bitterneſſe and gall of it in our own hearts.* A pardon eaſily obtained takes off the burden of the fault. Thus God dealt with *David*, the light of Gods favour doth not preſently break thorow the cloud, that ſo *David* may feel how bitter a thing it is to ſinne againſt God. As God ſuffered *Iſaac* to be bound, to have wood laid on him, the knife to be lifted up to ſtrike him, in all which ſpace, *Iſaac*'s fear could not but heighten. Thus God alſo will kill and wound thoſe, whom he intends to make alive: he will bruiſe them, and break them, that ſo they may judge the ſeeming good in ſin, to be nothing to the real evil that followeth it.

Reaſ.3. And from this ſecond iſſueth a third Reaſon, *viz. To make us more watchfull and diligent againſt the time to come: Peters* bitterneſſe of ſoul, was a ſpecial preſervative againſt the like temptations; as bitter potions kill the worms in childrens ſtomacks. It muſt needs argue much guilt in Gods people, if after the particular gall and wormwood they have found in ſin, they ſhall be ready to drink the like bitter potion, when ſin preſents it ſelf. Certainly, the heart-aches that *Paul* found afterwards, though pardoned for his former perſecutions, were like a flaming ſword to keep him off from ſuch attempts again; He might more truly ſay then that Heathen did, *He would not buy repentance ſo dear.*

Reaſ.4. 4. By reaſon of the *difficulty, and ſupernatural way of believing, it is, that pardon may be in heaven, when we cannot apply it in our conſciences.* Hence though the promiſes be never ſo much for our eaſe, and thereupon infinitely to be deſired, yet the way of believing this, is ſo far above natural conſcience, which expects Juſtification by works, that the heart of a man hath much

much ado to close with it. Therefore faith is not like other graces or duties (*viz.* love of God, humility, &c.) which have some obscure footsteps in the natural dictates of conscience, but it is wholly supernatural; yea *Adam* in the state of integrity knew not this kinde of beleeving in the righteousnesse of a Mediatour. For as the object of Faith, *viz.* Christ, is only by revelation, no councel of men or Angels could have excogitated such a truth; so Faith, as it is the hand or organ applying Christs righteousnes, is a duty not manifested by humane light, but wholly from above. And as flesh and bloud doth not reveal to us, That Christ is the Son of the living God, so neither that we are to have remission of sins only by faith in his bloud. Hence the Scripture makes faith the gift of God, which coming from the Spirit into our hearts, meeteth with much contrariety and opposition of doubts and unbelief. No wonder therefore if after the heart of a man hath been awakened for sinne, there remain some commotions a long while after: even as the sea after tempests and windes, though they be allayed, yet for some space after roareth and rageth, not leaving its troubles presently, as you heard before. Though therefore as God pardoneth in heaven, he offereth it also unto our consciences, yet we refuse and put it off, we will not be comforted, because it is not a comfort flowing in the way we look for, *viz.* by working. And for this reason, though *David* heard *Nathan* pronounce his pardon, yet he doth vehemently importune for it afterwards in *Psal.* 51. as if he had not the least notice of any such mercy to him.

Lastly, *God defers the notice of pardon to thee, that so thou mayest be the more able to sympathize with those that are in the like tempted condition.* For as one end of Christs suffering in his soul, lying in agonies under Gods displeasure, was because he might know how to have compassion upon his children in such temptations: So the Lord doth exercise his people to the same purpose; and certainly Christ accounted this, the tongue of the learned, to speak a seasonable word to a wounded heart. Besides, hereby shall we speak the more wonderfully of Gods grace, and his goodnesse, after our deliverance out of those storms. Those that have been in these deep waters, see the wonderfull works *Reas.* 5.

of

of the Lord, and so have their hearts and mouths the more opened to celebrate his praise.

What directions should be given a soul under temptation about pardon of sin.

Another Question may be, *What Directions are to be given unto a soul tempted about the pardon of sin? for many such there are, who like* Pauls *fellow-passengers in the ship, have been so many dayes, moneths, yea it may be years, and have seen no Sun, enjoyed no comfort at all.*

Let the persons thus affected use these remedies:

Direct. 1. First, *Acknowledge God, and clear him howsoever.* Thus *David, Psal.* 51. *That thou mayest be clear, when thou art judged.* If the devils and the damned in hell have no cause to complain of God as unjust, or too severe, then much lesse mayest thou who art kept in darknesse for a season only, that afterwards thou mayest enjoy the more light. Let not God be the worse God, his goodnesse the lesse unto thee, because thou art not yet set free out of the bonds of sin. By being thus humble thou takest the way to be filled, whereas impatiency and discontent causeth God the more to hide his face.

Direct. 2. Secondly, *Examine thy repentance, whether that hath been so sound, so pure, so deep, so universal, as it should have been.* All sorrow and humiliation for sin, is not godly repentance. *Ahabs* tears and *Peters* differ as much as the water of the sea, which is brinish and salt, and the water of the clouds, which is sweet. *David*, Psal. 32. acknowledgeth the pain and gripes he had within, because of sin: and no wonder he did not confesse it and bewail it before God. If therefore God keeps thy heart in many doubts and fears, giving thee no rest; consider whether thou hast cast all that leven out of thy house, whether every *Achan* within thee be stoned or no. It is in vain to cure the wound, as long as any splint of the poisoned arrow lieth within it, or if thou finde no sin unrepented of, search whether thy formal lazy duties be not the cause of all the blacknes that is in thy heart. We reade in the *Canticles*, that the Churches lazinesse, and her not opening the doors to Christ when he knockt, was the cause of that spiritual desertion she was plunged into, seeking up and down for her beloved, but not finding of him. The standing pool begets the croaking frogs, not the running stream: and it is the dull, negligent Christian, whose heart is filled with sad

fears

fears and doubts, whereas the hidden manna and white stone is promised to him that overcometh.

Thirdly, *Though thy soul walk thus in darkness, yet exercise acts of dependency and recumbency upon Christ howsoever.* As *David* many times cals upon his soul to trust in God, and not to be sinfully dejected. How is that woman of *Canaan* commended for her faith? who, though our Saviour called her *dog*, and did in effect tell her, she was excluded from pardon, did yet earnestly pursue him, and gave him no rest, till he gave her rest. And certainly, this is the noblest act of faith, this is indeed to give glory to God, when in the midst of all thy fears and guilt, thou canst rely upon him for pardon; as in wicked men who are filled with Satan, as *Ananias* was, there is πληροφορία τῆς θέσεως, a desperate boldness, whereby they dare venture upon sin: So in the godly there should be πληροφορία τῆς πίστεως, a confidence of faith, whereby maugre the devil and our consciences, we dare throw our selves into the arms of a promise. Thus by frequent putting forth of strong, fiducial, applicative acts of faith, we shall at last enjoy obsignative. Howsoever, hereby thou wilt shew thy heavenly courage in enduring a kinde of spiritual martyrdom. As that love is the highest love, which is carried out to enemies; so those are the strongest acts of faith, which make us depend on God, though he seem to kill us, yea to damn us. Direct. 3.

LECT. XXIV.

Whether in Repentance the difference between great Sinnes and leſs is to be reſpected.

MATTH. 6. 12.

And forgive us our debts.

ANother Queſtion, which is alſo of great uſe, we are to diſpatch at this time, viz. *Whether a believer repenting and ſuing for pardon, is to make any difference between a great ſin and a leſs?* For if a man ſhould be perſwaded of the *negative*, then would groſs and notorious ſins, which *Tertullian* cals, *devoratoria ſalutis*, whirlpools and gulfs, wherein the party offended is plunged, be no more then thoſe ſins which *Auſtin* cals, *Quotidiana & levia*, daily infirmities, which continually flow from the moſt ſanctified perſon. Again, on the other ſide, A Chriſtian falling into ſuch a groſs ſin, may ſo far be ſwallowed up with ſorrow, as that he ſhall think the whole bond of friendſhip is diſſolved between him and God, that he is caſt out of that ſpirituall Paradiſe he was in, and that God is no more his Father, nor he his childe. It is therefore neceſſary to have a pillar of fire to guide us in this wilderneſs. And that the whole truth of this matter may be underſtood, obſerve theſe Propoſitions.

Propoſitions premiſed concerning this Queſtion.

Firſt, *Every ſinne even the leaſt ſinne doth deſerve eternall death:* As appeareth by thoſe generall places, *Curſed is every*

one

one that abideth not in all things the Law commands, Gal. 3. 10. Now every ſin is a tranſgreſſion of the Law. This the Apoſtle ſpeaks univerſally of all ſin, without any exception, *Rom* 6. 23. *The wages of ſinne is death.* And indeed this muſt needs be ſo, if you conſider the leaſt ſinne is an offence againſt an infinite God: and in this reſpect, becauſe God is not a *little*, but a *great God*, ſo every ſinne is not little, but a great ſinne. Again, if you conſider the neceſſity of Chriſts blood to expiate this, no ſin can be thought little: for if a man had no ſin in the world, but one of theſe little ones, he could not eſcape eternall wrath, without Chriſts mediation.

Therefore we cannot ſay any ſin is veniall, either from its kinde and nature (as Papiſts diſtinguiſh) ſuch they make to be officious, or jeſting lies; or from the imperfection of the act, ſuch they make thoſe that are committed indeliberately, or out of ignorance, without full conſent or knowledge. Or from the ſmalneſs of the matter, as to ſteal a farthing, or the like. None of theſe ſinnes are ſo ſmall, but that they deſerve hell, becauſe they are the tranſgreſſion of the Law of an holy and great God; and our Saviour confirmeth this, when he ſaith, *Of every idle word a man ſhall give an account*, Matth. 12. 36. and that phraſe *of giving an account*, is not a *diminutive*, but *aggravative* expreſſion: Our Saviour doth there argue from the leſs to the greater, thus, If a man muſt give an account for every idle word, much more for blaſphemy againſt the holy Ghoſt.

Take we heed therefore, how we bring down the weight and guilt of the ſin; here alſo we may ſee, why *Paul* found ſuch a mountain upon him, by ſinfull motions only ariſing in his heart.

There are two places that ſeem to import ſuch a difference between ſins, as if ſome only deſerved hell, and others not. The firſt is, *Mat.* 5. 22. where our Saviour ſpeaking of three degrees of ſinne, doth proportionably aſſign three degrees of puniſhment, and the laſt only is guilty of hell fire.

But the clear anſwer is, That our Saviour ſpeaks alluſively to thoſe three Courts of Judicature among the Jews, the leaſt puniſhment whereof was death; ſo that the firſt Court puniſhed

with death, the ſecond, death with a more grievous torment, the third with a moſt grievous. For that our Saviour doth only allude to theſe Courts, and not ſpeak of what faults the Courts puniſhed, is plain; for none can think that the Court put any to death for calling his brother fool. It was murder and ſuch ſins that they puniſhed with capitall puniſhments. The other place is, 1 *Joh.* 5.15,17. where the Apoſtle makes a difference between a ſin unto death, and a ſin not unto death, but that is clearly to be underſtood either of the ſin againſt the holy Ghoſt (which in thoſe times, when the ſpirit of diſcerning was frequent, might eaſily be known) or of ſuch ſin that did plainly diſcover obſtinacy and impenitency accompanying of it, otherwiſe no man might pray for another man that hath committed a mortall ſin, if by a ſin unto death, the Papiſt will mean every mortall ſin.

Lay therefore this foundation, That every ſinne is mortall, in reſpect of its deſert and guilt, howſoever to the godly believing and repenting, no ſin is mortall, but all veniall, *Rom* 8. 1. *There is no condemnation to thoſe that are in Chriſt Jeſus.* Therefore *Muſculus* obſerves well, That in this caſe, the perſons offending are to be conſidered (whether they be believers) more then the ſins themſelves.

A ſecond Propoſition.

Howſoever every ſin, even the leaſt, doth thus deſerve eternall damnation, yet there is a great difference betwen ſome ſins and others. And therefore ſin is not a meer negation, but a privation, as diſeaſes are, and ſo as one diſeaſe may be more deſperate then another, ſo may one ſin be more hainous then another. The Stoicks thought all ſins alike. And *Cyprian* among the Ancients, is reported by the Learned to have been of that minde. But Scripture doth evidently confute this, *He that delivered me unto thee hath the greater ſinne*, Joh. 16.11. So you have the phraſe to be *worſe then an infidell*, 1 Tim. 5.8. Thus *Ezek* 16.47. *Iſrael* is ſaid to be *more corrupted*, and to do *more abomination then Sodom.* For although to ſin be to miſſe the mark, yet ſome may ſhoot farre wider from it then others, one ſin therefore may be more hainous then another divers waies, as Divines ſhew: As

First,

First, *From the perſon offending*, if he know the will of God, or if he be in publike place and office.

Secondly, *From the object*; If it be ſin againſt God immediately, or man only, as *Eli* ſaid, 1 *Sam.*2.25. *If one man ſin againſt another, the Judge ſhall judge him, but if a man ſin againſt the Lord, who ſhall intreat for him?*

Thirdly, *From the matter* about which, if it be in the life of a man, and not in his goods, that thou wrongeſt him. Some alſo may be aggravated from the diſpoſition of the man, the means he enjoyes to overcome ſinne from the frequency of it, or defending of it, and the like. Hence ſomē ſins are compared to *Camels*, others to *Gnats*, ſome to *Beams*, others to *Moats*, ſome to *talents*, others to *farthings*. This then being clear, let us conſider, what difference a true believer ſhould make between theſe in matter of pardon, and what difference he ſhould not make.

The Queſtion ſtated in theſe Propoſitions following.

And in the firſt place, he is to make a vaſt difference about them, *when he ſueth out for pardon*. As

1. This difference is to be attended in ſuing for pardon.

1. He is to believe Gods wrath is more kindled againſt him, and that his indignation burneth more hotly, when ſuch an iniquity is committed, then in our daily infirmities. Thus when *Aaron* had made the Idolatrous Calf, how angry was God both with *Aaron* and the people? How angry alſo was God with *David* after his murder and adultery? *David* had continuall infirmities, but God did not break his bones for them, he made not ſuch a breach upon his peace and conſcience, as he did in theſe ſins: Therefore it muſt argue *high prophanenſſe* of ſpirit, if a man after the committing of groſſe and loathſom ſins be no more troubled, then for the continuall motions and incurſions which ſinne neceſſarily makes upon us. No, as ſins have a greater guilt in them, ſo Gods wrath is ſtirred up in a more vehement manner againſt ſuch.

2. In reſpect of humiliation.

2. There is a great difference to be made *in reſpect of humiliation, and the meaſure of godly ſorrow for it*. For as the ſin may exceed another, as much as the Camel doth a Gnat, ſo ought the ſorrow, as much as an ocean doth a drop. Thus *Peter* goeth out, and weeps bitterly, he did not ſo for every defect, and ſpirituall imperfection in him, as for this abominable apoſtaſie.

We reade also of the incestuous person, as he committed a sin, that was not so much as named among the *Gentiles*, so he manifested such sorrow as was scarce heard among Christians; insomuch that the Apostle was afraid of him, lest he should be overwhelmed with too much sorrow. Now if for every sin of infirmity there should be as much sorrow and humiliation, as for these crimson and scarlet sins, how would the whole life of man be but a continuall trouble of soul? and in what darkness would he live alwaies? Although all thy continuall failings ought to be matter of humiliation unto thee, yet when such as these shall break out, thy soul ought to set open the flood-gates of thy soul. Neither may this be thought a low mercenary way, as if the party so humbled did intend a compensation unto God. But all places of Scripture must be regarded, as those which speak of Christs glorious grace; so also those which speak of our duties.

3. Grosse sins procure wrath, and hinder the consolations of Gods Spirit.

3. The Spirit of God doth not only in his Word reveal a *greater wrath* against such sins, but he doth also *withdraw all those consolations and comforts which were in the heart before.* So that a man thus offending, doth, as it were, bolt himself in a dark dungeon, and shut out all the beams of the Sun against him. Insomuch that although assurance, and the consolations of the holy Ghost may consist with the weaknesses, and sinfull infirmities of Gods people; yet they do not with the grosse impieties they plunge themselves into, as appeareth in *David*, Ps. 51. who prayeth *for the restoring of that salvation he had lost by his sin.* The Spirit of God is a *Dove*, and that delighteth not in noisome buildings. The Spirit of God may be *grieved* and *quenched* in respect of the fruits thereof: So that a man thus wounded for sin, feels a very hell in his heart, admits of no comfort. Neither can it be otherwise, for when we refuse the Spirit of God *sanctifying*, we presently repell it *comforting*. If we have not the *heat* of this Sun, neither shall we have the *light* thereof.

4. Grosse sins exclude from the society of the faithfull.

4. In these grosse offences the Spirit of God doth not only forsake him in respect of consolation, but its a command laid upon the Church-officers *to cast such an one out of their society*, as 1 *Cor.* 6. neither may the people of God have any *familiar communion* or *acquaintance* with such: now what horrour and trembling

trembling may justly arise in such a mans heart, who shall thus be cast out of all *gracious priviledges*, and that by Gods appointment? What darkness must this work in his heart, when he shall argue thus with himself; Its Gods command I should not be admitted to the seals of his love; he hath given his Officers charge to pour no oyl in my wounds; how can I plead for the grace signified, when he denieth me the *seals* thereof? God hath shut me out like the unclean leper, and whither shall I go? Now then, if the Church of God make such a vast difference between him and others, and that following the directions of Christ; Ought not the person offending also, to judge the same things about himself?

5. In some kinde of grosse sins, although there may be deep humiliation, yet there are many other conditions requisite, without which pardon of sin cannot be obtained, and that is in sins *of injustice, violence and fraud of others*. Thus *Zacheus*, it is not enough for him to beleeve Christ the *Messias*, and receive him into his house, but he makes *satisfaction* where he hath done wrong. Thus our Saviour also, *Mat.* 5. *If thou remember any man have ought against thee, leave thy gift at the Altar, and go and be reconciled.* It is a known saying of *Austin*, *Non remittitur peccatum, nisi restituatur ablatum*, The sin is not remitted, unlesse what thou hast unjustly taken be restored. And it is a most wretched perverting of the sense, which an Antinomian makes (*Reconcil. with God*, pag. 90.) that this reconciliation is to be made of man to man, but not true in respect of God to man; and whereas the same Author speaks of *Zacheus*, that he did *beleeve* first, and afterwards *made restitution*, which (*pag.* 91.) he cals an example beyond all exception; let him the second time consider *Zacheus* his expression, and he will see it nothing to his purpose. The words are in the present tense, *Luke* 19. 8. *Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have wronged any man, I give him fourfold.* Now either *Zacheus* means this of his former life past, or else he declares his ready and prepared will for the time to come; and there are Interpreters of both sides, and which may soever you expound it, it overthroweth the adversaries sense. For if it be understood of his course

5. Some grosse sins require many conditions before pardon.

of life, *formerly past*, then it goeth clear against him. If of his readineſſe of minde for the *future*, it makes nothing for him. For although by this it will appear, That *Zachens* did joyfully receive Chriſt before he made *actuall reſtitution*, yet not before he had a *preparedneſſe*, and reſolution of heart to do it. And certainly *Zachens* ſpeaking thus to Chriſt, *Behold I give*, cannot but be underſtood, that this penitent frame of heart was upon him before he ſaid ſo. If *Zachens* ſpeaks this of his former courſe of life, then he doth manifeſt this not in a way of pride or oſtentation, but to ſee whether Chriſt would command him to do otherwiſe, ſo that he might be thought to ſay this, for inſtruction ſake, to be directed for the future.

6. Groſſe ſins require a more intenſe act of faith to apply pardon.

6. As there muſt neceſſarily be more ſorrow, and will be greater terrours from the Lord, ſo there is alſo required *greater and ſtronger acts of faith, whereby pardon may be applied*; For the agony and temptation being greater, the ſtrength of faith alſo muſt proportionably be encreaſed. Hence we ſee the inceſtuous perſon was almoſt overwhelmed; ſo great a matter was it to exerciſe faith, when God was apprehended thus angry: and certainly, if faith be a grace ſo difficultly put forth even for the *leaſt* ſinne; What conflicts muſt there needs be, when nothing but *mountains* are in the way, and great gulfs apprehended between pardon and him? The mariner doth need more skill and ſtrength in a *tempeſt*, then in a *calm*; and the ſouldier muſt ſhew more courage in the midſt of a furious battell, then when all things are quiet.

Some particulars wherein no difference is to be put between great and leſſer ſins.

Thus you ſee wherein a great difference is to be made. Now there are ſome particulars wherein a *Believer repenting is to make no difference at all*. And that is in theſe things.

1. In reſpect of the efficient cauſe of pardō.

Firſt, There is no difference in reſpect of the *efficient cauſe, Gods grace in pardoning*. The godly man is not to think, that God can more eaſily pardon leſſe ſinnes then great ſinnes: No, all theſe are equally pardoned by him. Even as in the earth, though there be great and high mountains in reſpect of other hils, yet both them and theſe are meerly as a *punctum* in reſpect of the heavens; So although

though ſome ſinnes exceed others in guilt divers waies, yet all of them in reſpect of Gods grace are but as a drop before the Sunne, which is quickly dried up. Hence when God proclaimeth himſelf in all his goodneſſe, he is deſcribed to be a *God pardoning iniquity, tranſgreſſion and ſinne*; And thus *Iſa.*1. he can make *ſinnes as red as ſcarlet, as white as ſnow*: So that compared to Gods grace, there is no difference at all.

Nor ſecondly, may any difference be made *in reſpect of the meritorious cauſe, which is Chriſts obedience and ſufferings*; For that cleanſeth away great ſinnes, as well as ſmall. And certainly, when we conſider what infinite value and worth the ſufferings of him, who is God as well as man, do amount to, the beleeving ſoul need not wonder, if Chriſt do away one as well as the other. In the red ſea, the ſtouteſt and moſt valiant Champion was drowned, as well as the meaneſt ſouldier. He is the Lamb that takes away the ſinnes of the world; and his blood is ſaid to cleanſe us from all our iniquities. Here is no difference made, from one ſinne as well as another. So that although thy great ſinnes require greater humiliation, yet not a *greater Mediatour* then Chriſt is; Thou muſt pour out more tears, but *Chriſt* needs not pour out *more blood*; ſo that in reſpect of Chriſts righteouſneſs applied, the leaſt and the greateſt ſinner are pardoned both alike; neither is it blaſphemy (though the Papiſts judge it ſo) to ſay, *Mary Magdalen*, and the Virgin *Mary* are both juſtified alike.

2. Nor in reſpect of the meritorious cauſe.

3. Neither may we make any difference in the *means of pardon thus farre, as if our merit and ſatisfaction were to go to the pardon of one, and not of the other.* We are to ſhew greater ſorrow, more means are to be uſed, yet we are not to judge theſe actions of ours, as having any worth or dignity in them for reconciliation, ſo that after we have done all, we muſt confeſs its grace only that pardons. And this is the more to be obſerved, becauſe it is hard not to do any thing *extraordinarily in a way of pardon*, and not preſently to *reſt upon this*, as if it had ſome *worth* in it. But certainly, if ſo be it be the goodneſs of God meerly to forgive us our farthings, it is much more his liberality

3. Neither in the means of pardon.

berality to pardon our pounds: and if by our ſtrength we cannot remove a ſtraw, how ſhall we a beam? But in the primitive times the Church being ſevere againſt groſſe offenders, appointed more ſolemn and extraordinary duties of humiliation for ſatisfaction to the Church of God in point of ſcandal, and in proceſſe of time theſe were taught to be *ſatisfactory* even to God himſelf.

4. No difference to be made as to the ſtate of Juſtification.

4. *Neither may this difference be made, as if leſs ſins might conſiſt with the grace of Juſtification, but ſuch groſs ſins did wholly exclude out of that ſtate.* For there are ſome who plead for the diſtinction of *mortal* and *venial ſins*; in this ſenſe, *venial* are all thoſe which may ſtand with the favour and grace of God to the perſon ſo failing: but *mortal* are ſuch, which (though a man hath been juſtified) yet being committed, will caſt him out of this Sonſhip. Such a diſtinction *Muſculus* acknowledgeth, *loc. com. de peccato*, and others; but this ſuppoſeth a total apoſtaſie from grace, which I have already diſproved.

Illuſtration. As the Ark was made of that wood which would *not be corrupt or putrifie*, ſo is the Church of God in reſpect of the *living members*. Therefore although Gods people in ſuch grievous falls loſe their aſſurance, feel wofull commotions of heart, yet they are not to conclude, That God hath utterly caſt them off. They are not to look upon themſelves as unſound, though they have been Prodigals.

LECT. XXV.

Of the Pardon of Sin under the notion of covering it.

PSAL. 32. 1, 2.

Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sinne is covered.

Blessed is the man to whom the LORD *imputeth not iniquity.*

David is styled by some Ancients, *The divine Orpheus*, by whose musick the wilde beasts, *evil men*, may be made tame; and certainly his material harp was not more efficacious to drive out *Sauls* evil spirit, then his *Psalms* are sanctified means to expell all corrupt affections in us. And although all Scripture be *equally* excellent in respect of the *Author*, yea and of the *matter absolutely considered*, yet *in respect of us*, our *direction* or *consolation* by reason of our present estate, one place of Scripture may be preferred before another: in which sense *Junius* interprets those Psalms that have their Inscription, *A Psalm of Degrees*, *A Psalm of Excellencies*, as the Hebrew word will bear it. Now this Psalm I am upon, may justly be so styled, because it hath a peculiar usefulnesse to those who are exercised about the *guilt of sin*; for here we have *David* like an anatomy opened, that we may be instructed. Hence the title of the *Psalm* is *Maschil*, which is as much as *giving instruction*, and it is observed by Commentators, this is prefixed commonly to those *Psalms* that have some choice, eminent Doctrine, especially a-

about afflictions, as this hath about *Davids* guilt and trouble under sin, and also his pardon of it.

The *Hebrews* call this Psalm לב *Cor*, *The heart of David*, because he is so affected with Gods displeasure for sin, and the excellency of the pardon. Therefore you must conceive the Text to be uttered by *David* as one *groaning* and *heavily pressed* with the weight of his sin, and crying out, *Oh how blessed and happy are they, who have their sins forgiven them!*

The text contains a description of the pardon of sin. 1. From several expressions to magnifie the mercy of it.

In which words you have *Pardon of sin described.*

First, From several expressions to magnifie the mercy, *Sins forgiven, covered, not imputed.* It is much to consider how ancient Interpreters have made a difference between the sins enumerated; as if there were divers *kindes*, or at least *degrees* of sin enumerated; and hereupon also they make a difference between *forgiving*, *covering* and *imputing*, as if one were more then the other; but we are rather to take it according to the Scripture custome, which doth use for amplification sake, to say the same thing in divers words, and this is *autology*, but not *tautology*. The difference that is, is from the several metaphors that are in the words. As the first word doth signifie *the taking away of sin*, which is a *burden*, *Blessed is he that is eased of such a weight*. The second, which is *covering*, doth suppose the *loathsome filthinesse of sin in the eyes of God*, and therefore by grace it is taken out of *his sight*. The third, *not imputing* or reckoning, is a metaphor supposing sin a debt, and God in his account will not set it upon our score; so that the several expressions are wonderfully comfortable; if sin trouble thee as an heavy weight on thee, pardoning is the easing and taking off this burden; if sin make thee to judge thy self *loathsom*, thou canst not endure thy self, pardon of sin is covering of it; if sin put thee in such a *debt to God*, that thou knowest not how to satisfie, pardon is not imputing.

2. From the adjunct of remission, viz. Blessednesse.

Secondly, This is described from *the adjunct, adherent to remission of sin*, viz. *Blessednesse*. The Apostle *Rom.* 4. alleadgeth this place, to prove, That a man hath righteousnesse imputed to him without works. But the pertinency of the Apostles Argument is disputed of: For how doth it from this place follow, That a man hath righteousness imputed to him without works?

This

This is as if a man should argue, He is a rich man, because his debts are forgiven, which is a *non sequitur*, because they are two distinct things. This makes *Piscator* and *Wotton*, with others, to make *Justification* to be nothing but *Remission of sins*, and that *Imputation of righteousnesse, and remission of sins* are the self same thing; a man being therefore accounted righteous, because his sins are not imputed unto him. Hence they deny, That the Scripture ever saith, Christs righteousnesse is imputed unto us, although in some sense, they grant it may be said so, inasmuch as by his death for us, he purchased remission of sin, which is our righteousnesse. This is to be considered of, when we speak of the other part of Justification, *viz.* Imputation of Christs righteousnesse. Although they that are for imputed righteousnesse, say, The Argument is good, which *Paul* useth because imputing of righteousnesse is immediately contrary to the imputing of sin; and therefore *Paul* might argue *righteousnesse imputed* from *sin remitted*; even as we truly argue, The night is not, Therefore the day is, because darknesse and light are immediate contraries, and the subject must necessarily have one of them.

Lastly, *This forgiveneſſe of sin is described from the subject in whom it is*, viz. *in him in whose heart there is no guile*; that is, who doth not cover his sins by not confessing, and not repenting of them, as *David* acknowledgeth he did for as while.

From the Text I shall raise such Observations as are to my particular scope. As

First, *That forgiveneſſe of sin is a covering of sin.*

This truth deserveth a diligent unfolding, because the mistake about it hath brought forth dangerous errours in two extremities, the one of the Papist, That because it is covered, Therefore there is no sin at all in the godly, otherwise God could not but see it and hate it, as *Pererius* and others argue. The other of the *Antinomian*, who infer from thence, That therefore God seeth not sin, or taketh notice of it in justified persons, as *Eaton*. What is meant by covering of sin.

To understand this aright, take notice, That to *cover* is a metaphorical expression, and we must not squeeze it too much,

leſt *blood come out in ſtead of milk*; Some make the metaphor from filthy, loathſom objects, which are covered from our eyes, as dead carcaſes are buried under the ground; ſome from garments that are put upon us to cover our nakednesſe, ſome from the *Egyptians* that were drowned in the red ſea, and ſo covered with water; ſome from a great gulf in the earth, that is filled up and covered with earth injected into it. Laſtly, ſome make it an alluſive expreſſion to the Mercy-ſeat, over which was a covering, which might ſignifie Gods grace through and in Chriſt, aboliſhing our ſins. Hence the Apoſtle attributes ἱλασμὸν and ἱλαστήριον, to Chriſt and his bloud, which is given to the Mercy-ſeat; we may not ſtrive for any of theſe metaphors, they all in the general tend to ſhew this, That God when he pardoneth, doth not look upon us as ſinners, but deals with us, as if we had never ſinned at all: as it is here made bleſſednesſe to have ſinne covered, ſo it is made a woe and miſery, *Neh.*4.5. not to have ſin covered, as *Nehemiah* prayeth againſt *Sanballat* and *Tobiah*. This expreſſion is alſo uſed *Pſal.*85.2.

How God by pardon is ſaid to cover ſin.

In the next place, we may conſider in what ſenſe God doth cover ſin when he pardons, and in what he doth not.

1. God is ſaid therefore to cover ſin from his eyes, *Becauſe he will not take notice of it in juſtified perſons to puniſh it with wrath and condemnation: although it be not ſo covered, as that God doth not ſee it to be angry with it, and chaſtiſe believers for it, yet it is ſo covered, as that he doth not ſee it to condemn believers for it.* We do not therefore make God to cover ſin (as an *Antinomian* ſaith we do) as if a man ſhould cover a thing with a net, where the object is ſtill ſeen, *Honey-comb*, *p.*57. but as to Gods hatred and revengefull condemnation, ſo it is wholly covered; and therefore thoſe expreſſions of taking away, blotting out of ſin, *&c.* do fully imply, that God giveth not an half pardon, but that he taketh away the offence, and whatſoever puniſhment (properly ſo called) belongs unto it.

2. It doth imply, *That God when he hath thus forgiven, deals with a man as no more in that particular a ſinner.* Therefore *David* after his murder and adultery are waſhed away, he is as white as ſnow in reſpect of thoſe actual ſins; and every true believer repenting, is bound to believe, that God doth this graciouſly and glo-

gloriously to him, That he is no more in Gods account that loathsom leper and unclean person he was.

3. It doth imply, *That God by degrees, and in his due time will cover the believers sins, as from his own eyes, so from the believers eyes.* So that the guilt of conscience, those arrows of the Almighty, shall not alwayes stick in his heart. Thus as mans love to another, covers a multitude of sins, he will not mention, charge or upbraid the party with them, so doth Gods love cover the multitude of believers sins committed by them, dealing with them as reconciled persons, not upbraiding of them, but bestowing all encouraging mercies upon them; so that if we improve this phrase of covering sin no further, we shall split on no rock, and yet the soul have as much comfort as it can rationally desire.

In the next place, hear what it doth not reach to, and wherein the phrase is abused: As

Some particulars not extended to in this phrase of covering sin.

1. *When we dream of such covering of sin, as that sin is wholly taken away; so that no reliques of original corruption abide in us.* Thus the Papists, *We must not* (say they) *suppose such a covering, as if sinne were still there, only God will not impute it, but it is such a covering as is a blotting sin out.* Now for actual sin, we grant covering to be a blotting it out, but for original sin, in the lusts thereof, We say, they are still in the godly, and properly sins, only covered, because not imputed to them: for the grace of regeneration, though it cut the hair of sin, as *Dalilah* did *Samsons*, yet it groweth again, as long as the root is there.

2. *We may not conceive sin covered in this sense, as if we By our subsequent good actions did cover sin*; So some have expounded *holy works* to be the *garment* that covers our nakednesse, but this would be our covering, and not Gods covering, whereas the *Psalmist* attributes it to God, *Psal.* 85 2. Therefore that exposition will not hold, which some bring out of *Austin*, explaining this covering of sin, as *Emplastrum tegit vulnus*, the plaister covers the sore, by healing of it: for although healing grace accompany Justification, yet it is not Justification.

3. *We may not conceive it said to be covered in this sense, As if God when he had pardoned, did not yet still retain anger against*

the

the persons sinning, and so chastize them. Though this Doctrine be much pleaded for, yet Scripture is evident against it. *David* had sin covered, yet God would not let the sword depart from his house. Thus *Job* weeth himself against sin with this consideration, *That God would see it in him, and take notice of it.* Job 10. 14. *If I sin thou markest me* (God seeth sin in *Job*) *and thou wilt not acquit me from mine iniquity*; and *Chap.* 14. 16, 17. He saith, *God doth watch over his sin, and seal it up in a bag.* Let not then the people of God delude themselves into security, by any false doctrine; and what wofull conclusions there are of a godly mans peace, when he fals into a grosse sin, I shall handle in another Question.

Neither fourthly, may we conceive of sin covered in a carnal grosse manner, *As if there were something interposed between Gods eyes and sin*; as if a mans face were covered with an hat, or a candle put under a bushel. The *Antinomians* similitude is grosse and carnal, [*Honey-comb, pag.* 275.] As a man looking thorow a red glasse, seeth the water all red within it; so God looking upon us in Christ, seeth nothing but the righteousnesse of Christ, and no sin at all; for the reason why our senses judge water red thorow a red glasse, is, because it depends upon the fitnesse of a *medium*, and that being indisposed, the eye is deceived; but God in looking upon us, doth not depend upon any intervening thing; and indeed Gods seeing of sin in this point, is not so much an act of his understanding, as of his will, decreeing to punish sin, or not to punish it. So that this similitude doth no wayes hold, for God in this matter of forgiving or punishing sin, is not to be looked upon as a natural agent, but voluntarily. So that all these things rightly understood, we may take that which is good and comfortable, leaving that which is corrupt and false.

Whether the phrase of Gods covering sin, favour the error, That God seeth not sin in believers. Answer negative.

And if the Question be made, *Whether the phrase of covering sin, make for that errour, That God doth not see sin in believers offending?*

I answer, no by no means, for these Reasons:

First, *Gods covering of sinne is to be limited onely to condemnation*, as I have proved; *Davids* sinne was at the same time open to God, and covered; open to fatherly chastisements,

ſtiſements, *covered* to revengefull condemnation. God did ſee it as a Father to be angry with him, not as a Judge to hate him.

Secondly, *Becauſe this covering is limited to thoſe ſins which are paſt, and repented of, not to new ſins committed; they are not covered without a new gracious act of Gods favour.* David before this ſinne committed that is ſpoken in the Pſalm, he had his former ſins covered, but this was not covered, till he did acknowledge it, and then ſaith he, *Thou forgaveſt the iniquity of my ſin.* Though therefore God ſhould not ſee the ſins paſt, yet the new ones committed, they are taken notice of by him.

Thirdly, *Becauſe though God hath covered them, yet God may and doth ſometimes afflict his people for their ſins, ſo that they cannot be in every ſenſe ſaid to be covered.* But I have ſpoken largely of this already.

Two material Objections are to be anſwered, and then I ſhall proceed. Two Objections anſwered.

The firſt is, *If ſin be in the regenerate, yet covered, and not imputed. How will this ſtand with the Omniſciency, Truth and Holineſſe of God? His Omniſciency, for he cannot but ſee ſin if it be there: His Truth, for God muſt needs judge of things as they are; If therefore ſin be there, he muſt judge it to be there, otherwiſe we make him like the wicked who covers ſin, he will not acknowledge it to be there: Now what Truth is this, to ſay of a regenerate man, He is cleanſed and waſhed from all his evil, and yet his evil is in him?* This the learned among the Papiſts do much urge, *Pererius, Tirinus*, &c. *At moſt* (ſaith *Suarez de Juſtific.*) *it makes remiſſion of ſin to be nothing but a remiſſion of the puniſhment, not of the offence or fault.* The very ſame is urged by *Antinomiſts.* Laſtly, *How doth it conſiſt with Gods holineſſe? for he muſt needs hate ſin in whomſoever he findes it; and therefore for the Saints to have ſin in them, and yet God not to impute it to them, ſeemeth a contradiction.* Object. 1.

But to all this the anſwer is eaſie. As for Gods Omniſciency, none ſay, but by that God beholds ſinne where it is; and in that ſenſe, ſinne is not at all ſaid to be covered; for he knoweth all in man. As for his Truth, God doth Anſw.

judge as the thing is, for as he seeth sin, so he judgeth sin to be in them, and according to that eternal Rule laid down, *Psal.* 89. 32, 33. *He chastiseth them with the rod, though he take not his loving kindenesse from them.* So that God doth not judge things otherwise then they are. And as for his holinesse, he is not only angry with their sins, but also would proceed to their eternal condemnation, were it not for Christ their Surety, so that their sins are punished, though not in their own persons. Neither is this a taking away of sin only in respect of the punishment, but of the offence also, God being wholly reconciled with his people, though the corruption (which is removed by Sanctification, not Justification) is by degrees purged away.

Object. 2. The second Objection is, *How can God see sin, seeing they have Christs righteousnesse, and there being no sin in that, therefore God must look upon them as in Christ, which is without any sin at all?*

Answ. The Answer is, that when we say, Christs righteousnesse is made theirs, it is not to be understood subjectively, as if it were a quality inherent in them (for then indeed God could not see sin in them) but relatively, he is their Mediator, and by his obedience they are acquitted, so that the righteousnesse is in Christ, but by faith it becomes theirs, not formally, but as the merit for which God doth justifie them, and God doth account it to them as theirs; now this is no contradiction, to be sinfull in our selves, and yet at the same time acquitted by the righteousnesse of another. It is true, those expressions of making Christs righteousnesse a formal righteousnesse; or as others, a material righteousnesse; and those Disputations, Whether Christs active or passive Obedience, both or either of them be imputed to us, hath much darkned the Question, whereas if we consider of it, as a relative righteousnesse performed by our Surety in our stead, the matter will be made much clearer: yet I speak not this, as if Christs active obedience were not made ours, as in time may be shewed.

Observ. 2. Pardon of sin duly valued by those only who inwardly feel Gods anger against it.

I come to the second Observation out of the Text, which is,

That those only do esteem pardon of sin as a blessednesse, who feel inwardly the anger of God for sin.

David

David here in this Psalm, being deeply wounded with the guilt of his sin, judgeth not his kingdom, his wealth, his conquest over enemies an happy thing, but pardon of sin.

Now the ground of this is, *Because such is our custom (though it be our weaknesse) to esteem of mercies more* carendo quàm habendo, *by wanting of them, then having of them.* The blinde man earnestly desireth sight. The lame man prizeth sound limbs; a people distressed with warre, and finding the bitternesse of it, commend peace. Thus it is here, a man afflicted and imbittered in his soul because of sin, he doth highly admire forgivenesse, and accounts those happy, that walk in the sense of Gods favour. Though innocency or freedom from sin may be *majus beneficium*, a greater mercy then pardon and reparation, yet this is *dulcius beneficium*, a more sweet mercy to the sense and feeling of him, who enjoyeth it. Hence that Christ and the Gospel might be exalted, God permitted sin to be, and the Law is on purpose to discover sin, and aggravate it, that Christ and his grace may be the more welcome.

The Uses of both points together, are

1. From the former, Doth God in pardoning cover sin? then with what boldnesse may true faith triumph? Why is the godly penitent, as if his sins were alwayes in bloudy characters before God? Why is he, as if there were no bloud of Christ, wherein these *Egyptians* are drowned? If thou hadst never been a sinner, thy heart would not have trembled. Is not forgivenesse making of a sinne not to be, as you have heard? So that as *Rachel* is mourning for her children, because they are not; so mayest thou be rejoycing, because thy sins are not, and although they be not covered out of thy sight, yet if covered out of Gods sight, that is thy blessednesse; better have them rise up alwayes in thy conscience, then once before God. Use of the first Observation.

From the second we may be instructed, who are the best Preachers of Christ, and the grace of the Gospel, who are Gospel-preachers, even such who make deep incisions and wounds first in mens consciences by the Law. The only way for a Minister to make his auditors relish and savour of Christ and grace indeed, is to keep them in a godly sense and apprehen- *Use 2.*

ſion of their infirmities. We are not in our firſt converſion only to have throbs and pangs after Gods grace, but alſo this hunger and thirſting after Chriſt, is to be kept up in the progreſſe of Sanctification: And therefore as thoſe Miniſters are to be blamed (if any ſuch) that do only preſſe duty, diſcover ſin, but never ſet forth the fulneſſe of Chriſt: So they alſo are to be blamed, who only preſſe ſuch Texts as manifeſt Gods grace, but never open that iſſue and fountain of all filth that is within us. Both theſe tempered together are like *Aarons* excellent compound.

Uſe 3. The laſt Uſe of Exhortation, is, *To be ſo deeply humbled and tenderly affected within your ſelves, that all within you may cry out, Bleſſed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth no ſinne.* O that every Auditor which heareth me this day, could with the ſame ſpirit, affection, and turning of bowels within him, proclaim this truth, as *David* did. What is ſaid of *Pauls* Epiſtles, is alſo true of *Davids* Pſalms, *Nunquam Davidis mentem intelliges, niſi prius Davidis ſpiritum imbiberis*, You can never fully underſtand *Davids* meaning, unleſſe you be poſſeſſed with *Davids* ſpirit. Now that you may be moved hereunto, conſider the motive in the Text, and the means to get it. The motive is *Bleſſednеſſe*; a man is never an happy man, till his ſins be pardoned. What makes hell and damnation, but meerly not forgiveneſſe? Thy wealth, thy greatneſſe, thy honours, cannot bring that happineſſe to thee, which remiſſion of ſins doth. Hence this is the cauſe of all other bleſſedneſſe. And obſerve, here is a great deal of difference between this place, *Bleſſed is the man whoſe ſins are pardoned*, and thoſe Texts, where he is ſaid to be *bleſſed that feareth alwayes*, or he is ſaid to be *bleſſed that walketh not in the wayes of the wicked*; for in the Text is ſhewed the cauſe or fountain of *bleſſednes*, viz. *remiſſion of ſin*, but in other places there is only deciphered, who they are that are bleſſed. A man that feareth is bleſſed, but his fear is not the cauſe of his bleſſedneſſe. A man that liveth godly is bleſſed, but his godlines is not the cauſe of his bleſſedneſſe, but his pardon of ſin makes him bleſſed in all his graces; Thou art bleſſed, not becauſe thou prayeſt, heareſt, liveſt holily, but becauſe God doth forgive all thy ſins and imperfections in theſe duties. If therefore your

graces,

graces, your holy duties are not the cauſe of your bleſſedneſſe, never think your outward mercies can be. The means to obtain this, is in the Text, *By having no guile in the heart*, that is, by not *hiding our ſins*, but repenting of them, and confeſſing them to God: *For this* (ſaith *David*) *every one ſhall pray unto thee in an acceptable time*, for this, that is, for this remiſſion, and becauſe thou waſt ſo ready to forgive, when I ſaid, *I will confeſſe my ſin, therefore ſhall every one ſeek to thee*; where by the way, let none abuſe that place, *v.* 5. *David* ſaid, *he would confeſſe*, and God *forgave it*; *David* did but ſay it, and God *pardoned it*; ſo ſome have deſcanted upon it. But to *ſay* there, according to the uſe of the Hebrew word in ſome places, is firmly to purpoſe and decree ſo reſolvedly, that he will be diligent in the practice of it. Do not therefore think that a meer lip-labour is that brokenneſſe and contrition of ſpirit, which God requireth as the means to pardon.

LECT.

Y

Lect. XXVI.

Sheweth, That God takes notice of, and is Angry at the Sinnes of Believers. The Aggravations of Davids, and so of all Believers sinnes. What Sinnes Believers may possibly fall into; And yet wherein they differ from the sinnes of other men.

Psal. 51. 9.

Hide thy face from my sinnes, and blot out all mine iniquities.

You have heard of the peculiar usefulnesse of the *Psalms* in respect of our conditions or temptations. What some Authors (I know not upon what ground) have said of the *Manna*, that it had the taste of all delicate meats in it, and gave a respective relish to what every palate desired; this may be truly affirmed of the *Psalms*, they have *a respective Direction*, or comfort to every ones affliction or temptation. Hence they have been called by some *The little Bible*, or *The Bible of the Bible*: For although the Stars be of a quintessential

ſential matter (as the Philoſophers ſay) *yet one Starre differs from another in glory.* And this *Pſalm* among the reſt, hath no mean excellency or uſefulneſſe, it being a ſpiritual Apothecaries ſhop, wherein are choice antidotes againſt the guilt and filth of ſin, ſo that every one may ſay that of this *Pſalm*, which *Luther* of another, *O Pſalme, Tu es meus Pſalmus, Thou ſhalt be my Pſalm.* The occaſion of this *Pſalm* is ſet down very diligently and punctually in the *Inſcription*, it was made when *Nathan* reproved *David* for his Adultery, after he had gone in to *Bathſheba.* The Hebrew word is tranſlated, *in the time paſt*, and ſo thoſe that excuſe *Naaman*, 2 King. 5. 18. tranſlate thoſe words, wherein *Naaman* begs for pardon for his bowing down in the houſe of *Rimmon* in the *time paſt. Thus (pardon thy ſervant) When my maſter went into the houſe of Rimmon——and I bowed my ſelf.* And they bring this Inſcription of the *Pſalm* to confirm ſuch a tranſlation. We are in this Pſalm to look upon *David humbled* for his grievous ſins, as a *Job* ſitting upon the dunghill, abhorring himſelf, becauſe of his ulcers and loathſomneſſe upon him, or like a wretched *Lazarus* full of ſores, lying at Gods Throne, who is rich in mercy. For mercy is the ſcope of the *Pſalm*, which he prayeth for in the *negative effects* of it, ſuch as *blotting out of his favour*, &c. And in the *poſitive effects* thereof, ſuch as *creating a new heart, filling him with joy and gladneſſe*, &c. And this Petition is enforced with ſeveral Arguments from Gods multitude of mercies, from his confeſſion and acknowledgement, with a ready ſubmiſſion to all Gods chaſtiſements, from the proneneſſe of every one to ſinne, becauſe of that original corruption ſeated in him, from the good effect this pardon ſhall work upon him, he will teach tranſgreſſours Gods wayes, ſo that his ſins as well as his graces ſhall inſtruct others. My Text is a prayer about that negative effect of mercy, which is expreſſed in two Petitions to the ſame purpoſe.

The text divided into two Petitions.

The firſt is, *Hide thy face from my ſins.*

A face attributed to God in a double ſenſe.

The Scriptures give a *face* to God in a two-fold ſenſe. There is the *face of his favour*, and *his love.* This *David* in the eleventh verſe prayeth God would not take from him:

And

And there is the *face of his anger*, and *his indignation*. This *David* perceiveth upon him, and againſt him, wherefore he deſireth God would hide it from him: So that it is an expreſſion from a guilty perſon, who cannot endure the juſt Judge ſhould look upon him; or rather from a childe offending, who cannot bear the frowns of his father, caſting his eyes upon him. *David* hath that filth and guilt now upon him, which he knoweth God cannot behold but with much wrath and indignation, therefore he prayeth God would not look on him. You ſee here *David* acknowledging, That God doth ſee and take notice of the ſins of juſtified perſons in a moſt provoked manner.

This prayer is expreſſed to the ſame ſenſe in the next Petition, *Blot out all mine iniquities*; wherein conſider the mercy prayed for, *Blot out*, a metaphor (as you have heard) from Merchants that cancel their debts, or as the Sun doth diſſipate and cauſe the cloud to vaniſh.

2. The extent of the Object [*All my iniquities*] Whether this extend to future ſinnes, ſo that all ſinnes, paſt, preſent and future are pardoned together, ſhall be conſidered in the ſecond place.

From the firſt Petition, obſerve,

That God ſeeth and taketh notice of in a moſt angry and provoked manner, the hainous and groſſe ſins, which a believer hath plunged himſelf into.

God is angry and provoked with the ſins of beleevers.

For this reaſon, *David* prayeth God would turn away his eyes, and face from him, even as the ſore eyes deſire to have the light removed, as being unable to bear it. And this aggravation of Gods ſeeing it, he mentioneth alſo, *verſ.* 4. *Againſt thee onely have I ſinned, and done this evil in thy ſight.* That God did ſee it, and was offended, did more trouble him, then the eyes of all the world upon him: So 2 *Sam.* 11. 27. where this Hiſtory is related, there is this peculiar brand upon *Davids* ſinne, that what he had done *was evil in the eyes of the Lord.* Therefore God did ſee it, and take notice of it, ſo as to be diſpleaſed with it. This Doctrine is worthy of all diligent examination, both becauſe it will be a ſtrong Antidote to keep Gods people from ſcandalous groſſe ſinnes, as alſo to enform how farre in ſuch ſinnes the people of God make a breach

breach upon their peace with God, and claim to the Covenant of grace. And although this Question hath been vexed in some respects with the scratching claws of the Schoolmen, yet I shall endeavour not to be so ill a seedsman, as to to sowe among thorns: Nor as one of the Ancients alludes, *Plantare nemus Aristotelicum juxta altare Dei*, Plant *Aristotles* dark grove near Gods altar.

And for the cleerer proceeding in this great point, I shall consider the Doctrine briefly in the *hypothesi*, as it was *Davids* case, and then *in thesi*, as it may be any believers condition: For *David*, take notice of two things,

First, The aggravation of his sin.

Secondly, Of the evil befalling him, because of it. *Davids* sin is at large mentioned, 2 *Sam.* 11. where you have severall aggravations of this ungodly act,

The aggravation of *Davids* sin in ten particulars.

1. He was a King, and so his wickednesse was the greater, by how much his person was greater. Men in place being like the Sun, which if it in an eclipse, causeth much destructive alteration to inferiours.

2. A man advanced by God to special mercies, both temporall and spirituall, and for him to sinne thus, we may cry out, *what ailest thou, O Jordan, to runne backward?*

3. The nature of the sinne was a very grosse one, against the light of an Heathens conscience, to deflour his neighbours wife.

4. It was a trespasse against his faithfull servant *Uriah*, who was venturing his life to preserve *David*: This was horrible ingratitude.

5. This aggravation God addeth, That he had many other wives; and for him, as *Nathan* wisely reproved him, to go and take the poor mans lamb, who had only that, this was to become very guilty.

6. Here was great deliberation and consultation, how to cover the matter, and to make *Uriah* the father of it. O where is *Davids* heart that it doth not smite him all this while?

7. To bring this wretched plot about, he sends *Uriah*

with letters to *Joab* for his own destruction; Doth not *David* here that which he condemned and prayed against so much in others, lie in wait like a Lion to devour the poor innocent?

8. His sin becomes more hainous, in that to colour this, he will have *Uriah*, and many other innocent persons set in the fore-front, on purpose to be killed, and afterwards with most transcendent hypocrisie, excuseth it with this, *The battel falls alike to all.* So that here is a sinne with many sins complicated in it.

9. When all this is done, *David* takes *Bathsheba* to wife, delights in her, and rejoyceth with her.

10. To make his sinne out of measure sinfull, after these horrid sins committed thus against natural light, as well as spiritual, we finde no remorse of conscience, no trouble of heart, till *Nathan* the Prophet come and arouse him. But presently upon his reproof, how doth this mountain melt like wax before the fire? and therefore let no man encourage himself with *Davids* sin, unlesse he finde in himself also *Davids* repentance.

The degrees of *Davids* repentance.

And therefore in the second place take notice, what way God takes to break him, and how much displeasure of God fell upon him.

First, *He hath great terrour and trouble upon him, which he expresseth by the most exquisite torment that is*, viz. *broken bones.* It was with him, as if all his bones were brayed and pounced together. Thus fearfull is it to fall into the hands of the living God, who even to his own people is a consuming fire. As the Sunne which useth to dart forth resplendent beams of lustre, by grosse and thick clouds is darkned and obscured: So *David*, who heretofore rejoyced in God, took comfort in his promises, doth now like *Dives* beg for one drop of comfort, and findes a great gulf between that and him, insomuch that it cannot come to him, nor he to it. Now what are all *Davids* pleasures, all his lustfull delights to these wounds of his soul? Hath he not bought repentance at a dear rate? Let the godly hear this and tremble, and do no such thing.

Secondly,

Secondly, As he found hell thus within him, *So God was also really displeased, his sinnes were uncancelled, till he repented.* So that Gods displeasure was not onely in *Davids* sense and feeling, but in Gods heart also. As the earth of his own heart was like iron, in respect of its yielding any fruit of comfort; so the heavens were like brasse. God had spoke to his soul to be like the mountains of *Gilboa*, on which no dew of his favour shall fall. Therefore he doth not only pray for pardon, but plenty and iteration of pardon, Multiply to pardon, as *vers.* 2. I need pardon again and again, I need a plentifull pardon, because I have sinned many sins in one sin. Now *David* might justly be more solicitous and fearfull about the pardon of these sins, because there was no particular Sacrifice appointed for murder and adultery, but an expectation of vengeance, either from God or man, but this must not be stretched to the *Socinian* errours, as before I have shewed.

Thirdly, *He found in himself a loathsomness, and defiling guilt upon his conscience, whereby like Adam, he could runne and hide himself, that God might not see him.* Hereupon he prayeth, *Wash me, cleanse me, purge me.* Oh how loathsome and abominable was he in his own eyes: If *Davids* righteousnesse be accounted a menstruous cloth, or dung by him; what debasing and abhorring thoughts must he needs have of his sins? he looketh upon himself as the swine wallowing in mire, and the dog licking up his vomit.

Fourthly, *He feeleth a spiritual consumption and languish upon him, that he cannot exercise any of those graces that he used to do.* Therefore he prayeth for a principal or voluntary spirit, that with delight and strength he may do Gods will. *David* ariseth as *Samson*, when his hair was cut off, thinking to do such great exploits, as he had before, but he findes his strength gone.

Fifthly, *He discovers a world of hypocrisie in his heart, and crieth out of that, praying for truth in the inward parts.* He now (probably) fears himself for an hypocrite, questions whether any truth of grace be in him at all; and certainly it might justly amaze and astonish him, to consider he could do all that wickednesse

kedneſſe deliberately in cold bloud, without any remorſe for a long while. This might juſtly plunge *David* into ſuch a chaos, that he might fear the very pillars and foundations of his ſoul were ſhaken.

Sixthly, *He had loſt all that boldneſſe and liberty ariſing from a good conſcience, in declaring Gods truth, and in reclaiming tranſgreſſours from their evil wayes*, verſ. 13. Some have ſaid that *David* in this interval loſt the gift of Prophecie, and making of *Pſalms*. I cannot tell that; but certainly guilt and ſhame had ſo ſealed up his mouth, that he could not reprove others for murder, adulteries, deſtructive craft, which he himſelf was ſo foully guilty of. It was the Ancients Rule, *Quicquid dicturus aliis prius tibi ipſi dic*, Speak that firſt to thy ſelf, which thou art to ſpeak to others. But how could *David* have any boldneſſe here, till there was a coal of fire from the Altar to ſanctifie him? So that all theſe things duly pondered, you may ſay, This Sermon is a ſpiritual-Anatomy-Lecture, wherein *Davids* ſin and puniſhment hath been ſo diſſected before you, that every wiſe hearer may prevent the like deſperate diſeaſe in himſelf.

The text conſidered *in theſi.*

And now I proceed to the *theſis*, or this doctrine in the generall. And this method I ſhall uſe:

First, *Speak of the ſins briefly the godly may fall into.* And then more largely *of their relation they ſtand unto God after the commiſſion of them, till they repent.*

What ſins Gods children may fall into.

And to the former two things are conſiderable:

1. The Nature of the ſins they commit. And

2. The Quality of them, whereby they may be differenced from the ſins of reprobates.

For the former, *There is no ſinne (except that againſt the holy Ghoſt) which a juſtified perſon, being left to himſelf, may not fall into, even ſuch ſinnes, that morall men, by the help of a naturall conſcience onely would readily abhorre.* Thus *David* with deliberation and conſent falls into adultery and murder, ſinnes condemned by natures ſtature-law: You have *Aaron* guilty of Idolatry. *Joſephs* brethren the Patriarchs, as much as lieth in them, murdering *Joſeph*; and

when

when they have cast him away into the pit, they sit down to eat, which implieth their wonderfull security: and we reade not of their repentance, till many years after, being awakened thereunto by *Joseph. Samson* he was like one of the Roman Emperours, a compound of vices and vertues, insomuch that doubt might have been made of his godlinesse, had not the Scripture put him in the Catalogue of Saints. *Peter*, although it was a passion of fear that caused his sinne, yet his sinne was very dreadful, to lie, swear and curse, in the denying of Christ. This was such a sin that *Peter* thought it not possible he should fall into it. For first at the maids accusation, by comparing of the Evangelists together, he doth not only basely deny himself to be *Peter*, but addeth, *He knew not Christ*, yea he knew not what she said: An expression which we use about a thing that we are in the highest manner ignorant of; and this he doth before all them that stood by. In the next place, after a little while (which as *Maldonate* computes, must be at least three hours) he denieth Christ again: We might have thought that *Peters* heart might have troubled him in that space, but in stead of repentance he aggravates his crime with an oath, he denied himself to be *Peter*; here was lying against his own conscience, accompanied with perfidiousnesse against Christ: Then the third time, a little while after, being accused again, he still increased his sinne, and did not only swear, but curse, that is, devote himself to the horridest judgements that can be, if he knew Christ, and this he did often, as that phrase, *He began to curse*, seemeth to imply; and his sin will yet rise higher, if that cursing he referred to Christ, but cursed and anathematized him, and all this while (though as some probably think) he heard the Cock crow, yet he repents not, till Christ looked upon him, and without question, would have denied him as often as the temptation was, had not Christ preserved him.

Thus I have given you examples of the hainous sins of Gods people, which are not to encourage in sinne, but if duly considered, a bridle against it. As he said, *Plus debeo Thomæ, quàm Petro*, He was more beholding to *Thomas* doubting,

then *Peter* believing, because by *Thomas* his doubt, Christs resurrection was more confirmed: So in some sense, we may more acknowledge Gods Wisdom and Goodnesse in his childrens fals, then in their Graces; for hereby we are to tremble in our selves at our own weaknesse, be more careful against sinne; observe the way they took for pardon, and admire Gods goodnesse, who doth not utterly cast off his prodigal children.

Thus you see there is no kinde of crime, which the people of God through their own neglect may not fall into. And as for that other Question, *Whether they may not frequently commit the same sinnes?* We have examples in Scripture for the affirmative, only the greater doubt is, *Whether after a thorow and deep humiliation they may relapse in the same sinnes?* But although we scarce have any instances of such in the Scripture, yet Gods command upon us to receive a brother seventy seven times offending, if he repent, may keep up the heart of such a sinner against despair, because goodnesse and love is in him as in the Ocean, in us as in the stream only.

The sins of Gods people in what kinde to be ranked.

The second thing considerable is, *What kinde of sinnes these are? Whether they may be called sinnes of infirmity, though so atrocious in their nature, or raigning sinnes?* Now herein godly Divines have differing expressions, though they mean the same thing. *Zanchy* in his *Thesis* of the Perseverance of the Saints doth industriously assert, *That all the sinnes which elect believers fall into, are sinnes of infirmity*: Thus he cals *Davids* and *Peters*: His main ground is, *Because every regenerate man hath a two-fold principle within, the flesh and the Spirit, both which fight one against the other: by which means they are never carried out to a full consent and purpose in any sinne they commit.* Hence he denieth they can be called raigning sinnes, or sinnes against conscience, that wast conscience, or that are from resolved purpose within. He giveth an instance from *Jonah*, and the mariners; We know the mariners had not any intent at first to throw *Jonah* into the Sea; Again, they rowed and used all their utmost endeavour to preserve him. Lastly, they pray to their gods, if possibly, they may not be necessitated

to

to drown him. Now in all this, the mariners, though they did throw him into the Sea, with their will and consent, yet they did it very unwillingly also. Thus, saith he, *Jonah* in this respect is like Christ, or grace in the hearts of Gods people. And first, The people of God have no purpose to cast him out. Again, they use their diligent care in temptations not to do it. Lastly, they beseech and importune God they may never fall so foully: Therefore if at any time they are overtaken, it is with an unwilling willingnesse. Thus he. Neither is it any marvel if he judge so, when *Bucer* thought an *Elect man, even before ever he be converted, doth not sinne with that full consent as reprobate wicked men do, but have many motions to the contrary.* Now although *Peter* in his denial of Christ, might be thought with unwillingnesse and reluctancy to do what he did, yet it is hard to say, *David*, who so deliberated and plotted to accomplish his wickednesse, did it not with some full consent at that time. And it may seem hard to call all the sinnes of the godly, sinnes of infirmity; Therefore others will grant them the name of raigning sinnes, but with this limitation, that this is not a total raigning: Sinne raigneth as a tyrant over them, not as a King; and although at some times, as in *Davids* case, there be no actual resistance made, because all the *actual exercise of Grace* is suspended, yet the seed of God doth in time revive again, and so doth cast out that usurper: So then, the Conclusion is, That the grosse sinnes, which some regenerate persons do commit, may be said to be sinnes accomplished with a full consent and delight, and for the time, no actual resistance made by the regenerate part, and so farre may be called raigning sinnes, but because God hath promised to blow up those sparks of grace in the godly, in his due time; therefore they raign but as tyrants, and that for a while, not as Kings, which then properly is, when sins are customarily committed with an antecedent and consequent consent.

But for the general, That there is a great difference between *Sauls* sins and *Davids*, *Peters* and *Judasses*, will appear evidently. Differences between the sins of the godly & reprobate.

1. *From*

Differ. 1. First, *From that principle of supernatural life*, which although much *weakned*, yet is not *quite taken away*, 1 John 3. *He that is born of God cannot sinne*, viz. so as *Cain*, or as *he* that is of the devil his father, *Because the seed of God abideth in him.* And *Paul*, Rom. 7. doth excellently describe this in the person of a regenerate man, where some Expositors do not limit the good he would do, or the evil he would not do, to motions and desires onely of the heart, but extend it to the outward actions done in the flesh.

Differ. 2. Secondly, There is a difference *in respect of God*: He doth not wholly cast off the one offending, as he doth the other. Compare *Sauls* sinne, for which God rejected him, and *Davids* together, and you would think *Sauls* sin farre the lesse, for *Sauls* was, because he spared *Agag*, 1 Sam. 15. and the best of the spoil, pretending it was for Sacrifice, and he dared not do other for fear of the people, but for this God rejected him. Now *Davids* was in a more grosse sinne against the light of nature, whereas *Sauls* was against a positive command of God only, and was a sin only, because forbidden, not from it self; yet God sheweth mercy to the one, and not to the other. Certainly, though Gods grace be the great reason of the difference, yet *Saul* sinned with more contempt and slighting of God, then *David* did. There was a more bitter root in one then the other.

Differ. 3. Thirdly, A difference also may be *seen in the consequent*. When *David* was reproved, how presently did he melt, and condem himself? There could not be such a sudden thaw of *Davids* heart, if like *Nabals*, it had been like a stone within him. Thus *Peter* also, as soon as Christ looked upon him, *He went out, and wept bitterly*. It is true, we see *Saul* and *Judas*, after their wickednesse committed, cried out, *They had sinned*, but yet it was only for temporal motives, fearing the losse of their honours or fame, and at most, out of a slavish fear of Gods wrath, not from any love of him, or faith in him.

Use. The Use is, *If David lie thus in his gore, and what Michal said falsly concerning him, is now true, hath made himself like*

one

one of the vile fellows, let him then become a pillar of ſalt to ſeaſon the godly. Without a gracious ſolicitude and diligent depending upon God, how quickly may a Starre become like a dunghill? You ſee that the Snakes, and other poiſonous creatures, which lie lurking in the holes of the ground, when the ſeaſon is cold, do yet crawl abroad under the hot Sun-beams. And ſo thoſe ſins which thou ſuppoſeſt crucified in thee, may revive upon a warm temptation. *Peter* could not be perſwaded he ſhould ever be plunged into ſuch foul perfidiouſneſſe, he thought all the men in the world would ſooner do it then he. Now to prevent theſe ſcandals, hearken alwayes unto the motions of Gods Spirit. While the Cock croweth, do thou go out and weep bitterly. While the Angel ſtirreth the pool, do thou preſently ſtep in: And if thou art at any time overtaken, continue not in the ſinne, return preſently. The Candle newly put out, if preſently blown upon, may be kindled again. The longer in the ſinne, the more ſenſleſſe and ſtupid thy heart will grow; And know that of *Bernard* to be true, *Illud eſt cor durum, quod non trepidat ad nomen cordis duri*, That is an hard heart, which doth not tremble at the name of an hard heart.

Lect. XXVII.

How farre grosse Sinnes make a breach upon Justification.

Psal. 51. 9.

Hide thy face from my sinnes, and blot out all mine iniquities.

WE come in the next place to declare, *How farre a regenerate man upon the commission of such grosse sins, doth make a breach upon his Justification.*

1. And for the further clearing of this, I shall lay down,
First, What it doth not. And
Secondly, What it doth.

And in the first place, *No grosse sinne committed by a justified person, doth make void the former pardon of those sinnes he hath been guilty of.* God when he pardons, he pardons absolutely, not with a condition suspended upon our future conversation, which if not performed, his pardon shall be revoked. The *Lutheran* Divines do generally oppose this truth, *Musculus* also in his Commonplace, *De remissione peccatorum*, handling this Question, doth encline to the affirmative, *That new grosse sinnes committed, make void the pardon of all former sinnes, so that all his by-past iniquities do* reviviscere, *live again in their guilt and accusation of such a man. Tompson* in his *Distribu.* pag. 48. Though he plead vehemently for the intercision of a believers Justification upon the committing of grievous and loathsome sinnes, yet he denieth, *That sinnes once*

once pardoned are ever imputed again, becauſe (ſaith he) *the irrevocability of that remiſſion doth onely depend upon the immutability of Gods counſel, whoſe gifts are without repentance. For although* (ſaith he) *there is a neceſſity of Faith and Repentance, that ſinnes be at firſt pardoned, yet that they ſhould continue or abide pardoned, there is no neceſſity of Faith; and therefore none are damned for paſt ſinnes pardoned, upon a defect of new Faith and Repentance, when new ſinnes are committed.* The Schoolmen handle this Queſtion, and generally deny, *That ſins pardoned ever are imputed again, unleſſe in a certain reſpect,* viz. *as farre as by-paſt ſins are virtually contained in the following ſin, as if by a new ſin a mans ingratitude is ſo great, that he becomes as guilty, as if he had all his former ſins incumbent on him.* But whatſoever mens judgements are, the Scripture expreſſions about pardon of ſin, which are, *The remembring of them no more, The blotting of them out, and throwing them into the bottom of the ſea,* &c. do plainly evidence, That God when he pardons a ſin, pardons it abſolutely, and for ever, ſo that it ſhall never live again to condemn him here or hereafter.

There are two places of Scripture that ſeem to give a check to this Doctrine. The firſt is *Ezek.* 18.24,26. where God ſaith, *If a righteous man turn away from his righteouſneſſe, and commit iniquity, his righteouſneſſe ſhall not be mentioned, but he ſhall die in his ſin. Quid clarius?* ſaith *Bellarmine:* What is more clear then this place? Hence this is ſtrongly inſiſted upon by Papiſts, *Arminians, Lutherans,* as the *Achilles.*

Now to this place, theſe Anſwers are given,

Firſt, That the Prophet ſpeaks not of a truly righteous man, but a phariſaical, bragging man, who hath a conceit of his righteouſneſſe, without any reality at all; and ſuch a feigned righteouſneſſe may quickly melt away; but this may ſeem too much forced (though learned men inſiſt on it) partly, becauſe the oppoſition is made of a righteous man to one really wicked; partly, becauſe it is ſuch a righteouſneſſe, which if a man had continued in, would have ſaved him, he ſhould have lived by it. Others therefore ſay, The expreſſion is only conditional, and by ſuppoſition, If he do this, which doth

only imply a *posse*, if a man be left to himself, not an *esse*, or that indeed he will do so; yea God useth these conditional comminations, as a sanctified means to keep a righteous man from falling. This is a good Answer. But there are others with whom I joyn, that say, The Scripture doth here consider a man as of himself, and what he is in his own power, not what he is by a Covenant of Grace (which is only *per accidens*, and *ex hypothesi*) a meer extrinsecal and accidental thing to a man. And now, speak of a godly man thus, we may say, that we may fall, and lose the favour of God; For although in respect of Gods Predestination and Covenant of Grace, he cannot, yet that is meerly external, and from without. So that the Scripture speaks of a godly man, sometimes in respect of his external, relative condition, as elected and federated: Thus he is made unchangeable in respect of his state. Again, in other places it speaks of him in respect of his internals, and what is dwelling in him; and in this sense, *He that stands must take heed lest he fall.* And that this is the right interpretation is plain, by the opposition in a wicked mans estate; for there saith the Text, *If the wicked leave his wickednesse, and do that which is righteous, he shall live.* Here is no mention of Grace at all; Can any from hence inferre therefore, a wicked man without Gods Grace, is able to turn to God? No. Other places demonstrate the necessity of that. So that it is plain, these Texts do not at all relate to any thing external and extrinsecal to a man.

The next place urged for the return of sins pardoned, is, *Matth.*18.32,34. where in the Parable, The Master is said to forgive a servant all his debt, but because the same servant shewed not the like compassion to a fellow-servant, his Master was wroth with him, and charged all the debt he had forgiven upon him again. By which it may appear, That if we after our sins are forgiven, do those things that are very distastefull to God, he will remember our former sinnes against us. But the scope of the Parable, which is the right key to open it, is not to shew, That God will remember sins pardoned for new ones committed, but to manifest, That forgivenesse of others is a necessary qualification to be forgiven by God;

God; and that we may not believe God will forgive us, unlesse we forgive others: and this is clear from the conclusion of the Parable, *ver.* 35. *So will not my heavenly Father forgive you, unlesse you from your hearts forgive one another.* Besides, every passage in the Parable is not Argumentative, but the chief intention only. Many things are flourishes in the picture, not lineaments.

In the second place, *Neither doth a justified person so sinning* 2. *fall from the grace of Justification, or his Adoption, he is not cast out of the right of his inheritance. Whom he loveth, he loveth to the end*; all this while, Christs Intercession is effectual for him. Though he be a Prodigal living with Swine, and upon husks, yet he is a sonne still, *Quod Christus naturâ, nos gratiâ*, as Christ is perpetually the Son of God by nature, so we in him, and by him, are alwayes the sons of Grace; and the perpetuity or stability of our Justification, is not founded upon any thing in us, but upon Gods will and love, and his sure promises.

Neither thirdly, *Doth he fall from the state of inherent or* 3. *sanctifying grace, no more then imputed*; For by Gods gracious Covenant, the principles of Grace are more firmly infixed and rooted in a godly mans soul, then his soul in his body. *Ut custodiat nos per fidem, custodit in nobis ipsam fidem*, That he may keep us by faith, he keepeth faith in us, saith a learned man.

Neither fourthly, *Doth a godly man fall into these grosse sins,* 4. *without a mercifull ordering of them, even to the godly mans good.* Although afflictions may befall a man to his good, yet some have questioned, Whether God suffers a godly man to fall into sins for good, because sins haue an inward malignity and poison in their natures, which the evils of afflictions have not. But if *Gregory* said truly of *Adams* sin, *Felix culpa*, it was an happy fault, because God wrought such a good, the good of a Mediator, which is a greater good then that sin was; no question but God can over-rule the sins of Gods people for their own advantage; as a godly man said, He got more good by his sins, then his graces, *Audeo dicere*, &c. (saith *Austin, de civit. Dei, lib.* 13.) I dare be bold to say it, That it is profitable

fitable for proud men to fall in manifeſt and open ſins, whereby they may be aſhamed, and made loathſom in their own eyes, *Salubrius ſibi diſplicuit Petrus, quando flevit, quam ſibi placuit, quando præſumpſit.* It was better with *Peter* diſliking himſelf in his weeping, then pleaſing himſelf in his preſumption. This therefore God doth to his people *to prevent ſin*, he lets them fall into ſin: And as *Auſtin* ſaith, *Sectio dolorem operatur, ut dolor dolore tollatur*, The cutting of the wound cauſeth pain, that ſo pain may be removed by pain, and ſometimes *venena venenis diſpelluntur*, poiſon is driven out by poiſon.

The Queſtion anſwered affirmatively. I.

And thus much for the Negative, we come to the Affirmative; and in the general we ſay,

A godly man committing ſuch a groſſe ſin, till he doth repent, is in a ſtate of ſuſpenſion from all the effects of Gods grace in Juſtification, though not of abdication or exheredation. He is under *ſequeſtration*, though not *ejection*; he is under an *interdiction*, though not an *exile*. He is as *Abſolom* that was caſt out of his fathers family, though not from being a ſonne. The Engliſh Divines expreſſed it well in the Synod of *Dort*, by a Leper who was ſhut out from his own houſe, ſo that although he had a right to his houſe, yet he had no claim by any law to enjoy his houſe: So though a godly man have a right to pardon of ſin, yet he cannot claim this as due to him, as long as the guilt of ſinne abideth on him. Hence that is expounded, *Purge me with hyſop*, as an alluſion to the Leper, who in ſuch a manner was cleanſed, not that this ſtate is to be conceived a third eſtate between a ſtate of Juſtification and Condemnation, but a ſuſpending of the benefits of the former. In which ſenſe a godly man juſtly caſt out by Church-officers for a ſin, is ſaid to have his ſins bound in heaven. And in this reſpect *Zanchy* ſaith, he doth, *Quodammodo excidere à gratiâ Dei*, and that they are made, *quaſi inimici*, as it were enemies. Thus *Perkins* alſo, Upon the committing of ſuch ſins, ſaith he, God turneth the effects of his grace into the effects, *cujuſdam odii*, of a kinde of hatred to their ſins, ſo that *Quodammodo fiunt inimici Dei*. Now that the terrour of this condition may more faſten on the godly to make them cautelous againſt ſuch fals, let us conſider what particulars this general doth include.

And

And first, *It supposeth a present unfitnesse for the Kingdome of Heaven, or any gracious priviledge.* There is no aptitude or preparation in a godly man so lapsed for comfort or salvation: but like the unclean man is to stand aloof off from all these. Now how wofull is this to consider, that such a man who had Gods gracious Scepter alwayes held out, to bid him come into his presence, must now finde the doors and gates of mercy for a season shut upon him! Now the master of the feast may say to him, *How camest thou in here without a wedding garment?* When *David* sate not, according to his custome, at the Kings Table, it was excused, he had uncleanness upon him. Alas, it is a godly mans aggravation of this guilt, why doth he not apply the promises as formerly? Why is he not had into the Spouses wine-sellar? Alas uncleanness is upon him. As Christ said to *Mary*, *Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended*; we may apply otherwise the promise of grace, Christ saith to thee, Touch me not, lay not hold upon me, for thou art not yet risen out of thy filth.

2. As there is no aptitude for gracious priviledges, *so also God doth now change all his dealings and administrations towards them.* Those effects of love, delight, comfort, assurance and sweetnesse they had, are now turned into the bitter effects of wrath, displeasure, trouble and grief of soul, sad pangs and convulsions of conscience, so that they have no peace with God nor themselves. Thus their sins swallow them up like *Jonahs* whale, and they are, as it were, in the bottom of hell. God is really offended and displeased with them, hereupon their conscience doth truly and sadly accuse them: And all this being set home by Gods Spirit convincing of them of sin in all the aggravations of it. Oh the groans and agonies their souls must needs conflict with! This *David* doth evidently teach us in what he felt upon him. Hearken then to *Davids* cryings and groanings, and take ye heed how you abuse the grace of God, either doctrinally or practically to a secure committing of grosse sinne. Be sure (if ye belong to God) your sinne will finde you out; and no doctrine of free grace will be Altar or Sanctuary safe enough for you to hide your selves in. God who was the God of all consolation, is now the God of all sorrow 2.

and

and fear. Thou thinkeſt on him, and thy meditations are not ſweet but troubleſom. Now its not the Spirit of God that ſeals and comforts, but of conviction and humiliation. Now Chriſts bloud, which thou deſpiſedſt, doth ſpeak bitter things againſt thee. A drop of Gods anger fals into the conſcience of a godly man thus awakened like a drop of ſcalding lead into a mans eye. O what comfort do thoſe pleaſures, thoſe luſts now afford him? Now he may ſay of them, as ſhe of her husband, *Thou art a bloudy husband.*

3. 3. Although he hath a right to the Covenant of Grace, to the priviledges contained therein, yet, as you have heard, *He may not without renewed repentance claim any of theſe.* He cannot ſay, my God, my Chriſt, my pardon; no, God hath ſpit in his face, as the expreſſion is to *Miriam*, and the ſoul is become filthy and noiſom, and ſhe muſt be waſhed again, ere Chriſt will receive her. Though there be a Well of ſalvation, yet thou haſt no bucket to draw out of it. As long as a godly mans heart ſtands thus averſe from God, and hath a purpoſe to continue in ſin, all the promiſes are like a fountain ſealed up, and a garden encloſed. He is in a worſe condition then the wounded man in the way to *Jericho*, for not only the Prieſt and the Levite (the Moral Law) paſſe by him, but even the good *Samaritan*, Chriſt and the promiſes pour no oil into his wounds. All the while he applieth comforts to his ſoul, and ſupports himſelf with hopes of Gods favour, he liveth upon ſpiritual robbery. And he can with no more truth (if we ſpeak of the actual uſe and application) ſay of the promiſes, then the devil of the world, and the glorious things thereof, *All theſe are mine.*

4. 4. *By this they incur the guilt of eternal damnation.* There is a two-fold guilt, as ſome diſtinguiſh, one *Potential* (which by others is *reatus ſimplex*, a *ſimple* guilt) another *actual* (which by others is *reatus redundans in perſonam*, a guilt falling upon the perſon. Now it is upon all ſides agreed, That by thoſe ſins he deſerveth eternal damnation. And therefore a godly man ſo offending ought to bewail the forfeiture he hath made. If God ſhould deal with him according to that ſtrict rule, *Curſed be every one that abideth not in all the things that the Law requireth*;

reth; where ſhould he appear? But may we not ſay, they have an actual guilt obliging them to eternal wrath, not abſolutely, but conditionally, till they take the means appointed by God for their pardon? I ſee not but in a ſound ſenſe this may be ſaid, for God doth not will to them ſalvation, while they abide in that ſtate, though at that time he wils to give them ſuch effectual grace, that thereby they ſhall recover, and ſo remove that gulf which is between them and God. So that at the ſame time God doth will to give them grace to repent and recover, and yet he doth not will ſalvation to them, till they do recover. Here is no contrariety in Gods will, becauſe though this be about the ſame perſon, yet not in the ſame reſpects, for Gods will not to give ſalvation while in ſuch an eſtate, and to give repentance that he may come out of that eſtate, do no wayes oppoſe one another; and becauſe of this later mercy, it is that we may alwayes ſay, *There is no condemnation to thoſe that are in Chriſt Jeſus.* Their ſins are never imputed to them for their condemnation, but there is a conditional obliging of them, till they ſue out their pardon. So that it is here, as *Solomon* did with *Abiathar*, 1 Kin. 2. 26. *Thou art* (ſaith *Solomon*) *worthy of death, but I will not at this time put thee to death.*

5. Becauſe of this guilt and demerit of ſin, it is, that our Divines do ſay, That if ſuch an one, *David* (for example) *ſhould die before theſe ſins he repented of, he would be damned.* For if you ſuppoſe a juſtified perſon to perſevere alwayes in groſſe and vile ſins without reformation, you may as well ſuppoſe him to be damned. Hence there is, as ſome obſerve, a twofold impoſſibility, There is an impoſſibility that *David* elected and juſtified ſhould be damned; There is alſo an impoſſibility, that *David* a murderer and an adulterer ſhould without repentance be ſaved; but God by his powerfull grace will unty this knot by a certain and infallible recovery out of his ſins, for that is a perpetual and ſure Rule, *Election hath obtained*, Rom. 11. otherwiſe, ſpeak of *David* as in that ſtate before repentance, we may ſay, if he had died in it, he would have been damned. Thus *Beza*, *Twiſſe*, &c. Yet Gods grace which was ſo potent at the firſt to raiſe out of the grave of ſin, how much 5.

rather if life be in us, will it quicken us to turn unto God?

6. 6 From hence further it ariseth, *That he needeth a particular Justification in respect of that guilt, which is to be done away.* Some orthodox and learned Writers, *Abbot* and others, distinguish of a two-fold Justification, one universal, whereby a man is absolutely received into the grace and favour of God, becoming his Son. A second is particular, whereby sins are remitted to them that are already made the children of God, without which they would fall from their first benefit of sonship, The one is called *Justificatio simpliciter.* The other, *Secundum quid.* And this particular Justification they make to be often repeated. Thus *Peter Martyr*, Rom. 3. *Lapsis post Justificationem, repetitâ denuò Justificatione per fidem condonari.* Thus *Bucer, Defensio*, p 85. acknowledgeth an iteration of Justification after we repent and arise from more grievous sins. Others call it not a particular Justification, but an application of that universal Justification. And certainly, Justification doth denote the state of a man, but seeing the remission of such sins doth not put them into a new estate (for they never fell from that) we cannot so properly call it Justification, and I know not any place where the Scripture cals it so; and it would be very hard to say, That Justification is reiterated as often as sin is pardoned. Though therefore there may be some difference in the words, yet the matter it self is clear, *viz.* There is a necessity of the removing of this guilt, that so the person offending may be brought into Gods favour again.

7. Seeing all this is true, then it followeth, *That such a man so offending must renew an act of faith and repentance.* So that the former acts of faith and godly sorrow, will not discharge or acquit from the new sins committed. Therefore lastly, it is a most dangerous errour in practice, to hold, *That after a known sin committed, the first thing a believer is to do, before repentance or humiliation, is to believe that that sin is already pardoned.* Thus a late Writer, *Cornwell* in a Treatise called *Gospel-repentance*, wherein he labours to prove, *That a believer entered into the Covenant of Grace, upon the commission of an actual known sin, ought to believe the actual pardon of that sin, before he actually repent of the same.* Now although this is to be confuted, when we

we handle Faith and Repentance, yet thus much we may say, That this Doctrine must needs be very unsound; For first, There is no sin actually pardoned before repentance, as at large I have shewed; and no sin is pardoned before it be committed, as in the next Question is to be shewed. So that it would be abominable presumption, yea and falshood to believe such a thing. Hence such a perswasion as this, God hath or will pardon my sins, can bring no comfort or peace to our conscience till we do repent; For a Scripture perswasion is, That God enabling me to repent, and to use the means, will vouchsafe pardon, and in this only can I have comfort. Besides, the Author makes the last work of faith the first; For upon a known sin committed, faith is to be exercised first, in the threatnings of God, to believe those due to him. In the next place, Faith is to rely upon Christ for pardon, that he may receive remission of sins; For as *Rivet* and *Perkins* urge well, *There is no pardon offered on Gods part, or received on mans, till he do believe, and then when these acts are done, God doth many times incline the soul to believe the sinne is pardoned. But the pardon of sin must be received by a direct act of faith, before we can believe that it is pardoned by a reflex.* But this is more largely [illegible] confuted.

Now the Objection may be, *How can sinne thus farre prevail in the filth and guilt of it, and yet the man so sinning not fall from his Justification?* This will be cleared, if you consider these things:

Why the guilt of new grosse sins doth not take away justification.

First, *That Justification is an act of God meerly, it is not our act.* We are said to be justified, and God he doth justifie. Now *Opus Dei non potest irritum fieri per opus hominis,* Those acts of God which he doth, we cannot make void, but he ordereth them for their time and continuance, as he pleaseth. 1.

Secondly, Consider, *That sin doth not expell the grace of Justification, efficiently, or physically, as darknesse doth light, or coldnesse heat, but meritoriously by way of desert.* Now God doth not with us according to our desert: when he entered into a Covenant of Grace with us, he so appointed it, that no sin should break the league of friendship, whereas if he had pleased, he might so have appointed it, that the least sin should 2.

have dissolved this bond; and if sin did expell the grace of Justification efficiently, the least sin would have done it. But now, if it was wholly at Gods pleasure to make this state dissoluble or indissoluble; and if so, then that neither great sins, or lesse should break it; and this makes us to wonder, how *David* in his adultery and murder could be justified, because we prepossess our selves with this principle, That sin doth by a natural necessity expell the grace of God, whereas many Schoolmen are bold to determine, That *de potentiâ absolutâ*, God might pardon sin, though there were no repentance, or infused grace at all in a man.

Occam. l. quæst. q. 8.

3. Thirdly, *That a particular, partial guilt, is not the immediate opposition to universal Justification of the person, unlesse it were to abide in him.* Justification of a mans person will keep him from being actually condemned, though not from the guilt of condemnation. As a guilty person, thrown into prison, is kept from the use of his house, goods, and all comforts, but he is not deprived of them, till he be actually condemned: so a believer falling into grosse sins, is deprived of the use of all spiritual comforts, but not cast out of the right of them, because he shall never actually be condemned.

Lect. XXVIII.

Whether God in pardoning do forgive all Sinnes together, as well future as past.

Psal. 51. 9.

And blot out all mine iniquities.

THe next thing in this Text to be considered, is the second Petition, which though differing from the former in words, yet is coincident in the matter.

In this was observable (as you heard) the Petition it self [*Blot out my iniquities.*]

2. The extent [*All*] *All my iniquities.*

Now from hence we may justly take an occasion to handle that Question, *Whether God in pardoning do forgive all sins together?* So that sins past, present and future are remitted together, for that is the opinion of some, *That as soon as ever a man is actually entered into the Covenant of Grace, all his sins, even future, are actually forgiven, and that they are bound to believe the same, even before they actually repent of any iniquity committed.* This at large *Cornwell* maintaineth in his Book of *Gospel-repentance.* Yea there are some learned and worthy Authors, who seem to encline this way. Dr *Ames* in his *Medulla*, in the Chapter of Justification, saith, *Not only the sins of justified persons that are past, are remitted, but also in some sort those that are to come. Neither* (saith he) *can sins past and*

preſent be altogether and fully remitted, unleſſe ſins to come be in ſome ſort remitted alſo. Only he makes this difference, Sins paſt are remitted by a formal application, ſins to come only virtually, ſins paſt are remitted in themſelves, ſins to come in the ſubject or perſon ſinning. But this is in effect to ſay, They are not remitted, but that God by his Covenant of Grace, will as ſins are committed, give grace to repent, whereby there may be a forgiveneſſe of them. This is to ſay rather, No ſin ſhall hereafter actually condemn them, rather then to ſay, they are forgiven. Dr *Twiſſe, vindic. Gratiæ, pag.* 82. *de Eurat. lib.* 3. *Quid ſi dicam in Juſtificatione noſtra,* &c. *What if I ſay, in Juſtification We receive the forgiveneſſe of our ſins, not only that are paſt, but of future alſo,* that is, *We are made more certain of their forgiveneſſe. For* (ſaith he) *that internal act of God, whereby he doth remit ſins, cannot be renewed in God. Certiſſimum eſſe judico,* &c. *I judge it moſt certain* (as he goeth on) *to whom God once doth forgive ſins, to the ſame man he forgives all his ſins whatſoever they are; of which abſolution there is indeed a frequent pronunciation iterated to penitents often in the Scripture.* Thus that learned Author going upon thoſe two grounds, 1. That pardon of ſin is an immanent act in God. 2. That application of pardon to us, is no more then the ſenſe and manifeſtation of that pardon, which was from all eternity. But the weakneſſe of theſe grounds hath been already demonſtrated, and we have other orthodox Writers ſpeaking more conſonantly to truth, denying that future ſins are forgiven before committed and repented of. When *Grotius* had objected, That the Proteſtants Doctrine, was *peccata condonari antequam fiant*, That ſins were forgiven before they were committed, *Rivet* in his Διάλυσις, *p.* 467. replieth, *Imò id nos abſurdiſſimum credimus,* &c. *Yea We think ſuch a Doctrine moſt abſurd, and the imputation of it to us, moſt unjuſt; For though* (ſaith he) *God decreed to pardon our ſinnes from all eternity, yet the execution of this is not from all eternity. As God decreed from all eternity to create the World, yet the world was not from all eternity. Thoſe that know God hath decreed from eternity to pardon ſin upon the condition of repentance. Thoſe that know God hath not decreed the end without the means, will never aſcribe to themſelves pardon of ſin, without theſe exerciſes of repentance.*

pentance. Thus the ſame Author in the ſame Book, *pag.* 533. *Abſurdum eſt credere*, &c. *It is abſurd* (ſaith he) *to believe a remiſſion of ſins, which are not yet committed, for neither in the decree of God is there an actual remiſſion decreed without repentance preceding remiſſion.* To this purpoſe *Perkins* in his book of predeſtination, *There is no actual pardon* (ſaith he) *offered on Gods part to us, nor on our part received without faith and repentance.* When *Thompſon* in his *Diatriba* had made mention of an anſwer formed by ſome Author, *That in juſtification all ſins paſt, preſent and future were forgiven, and a juſtified perſon was bound to believe this*; Biſhop *Abbot* in his Anſwer, *cap.* 24. cals this *incommodè dictum*, an incommodious expreſſion, and argueth againſt it.

Having premiſed this, I come to lay down the grounds, That ſins are not pardoned to a juſtified perſon before they be committed and repented of, and therefore it is dangerous preſumption to believe ſuch a thing. Only theſe things muſt be acknowledged. Three things laid down by way of conceſſion.

First, That God when he *pardons ſins paſt* to thoſe that repent, *He forgiveth all them together.* God doth not pardon ſome, and leave out others. Thus the gracious promiſe, *Heb.* 8. of remembring our iniquities no more, and blotting them all out, is to be thus farre univerſally interpreted, that all thoſe ſins which then are found in the lives of believing perſons, ſhall be removed and taken away. All paſt ſins are forgiven together. And the ground of this truth is two fold, partly becauſe the ſame grace and love of God which moveth him to blot out one, will alſo ſtirre him up for the other. And indeed if it were not ſo, God would have love to a man as his friend, and hatred to him as an enemy at the ſame time, whereas remiſſion is reconciliation with God, and therefore every obſtacle muſt be removed, Partly this ariſeth from the nature of repentance, for where that is truly for one ſin, it is alſo for all other ſins, and then the guilt of all muſt needs be taken away. 1.

2. We muſt grant, *That to ſpeak properly, there is nothing future to God, and thoſe things that are not yet to us, they are preſent to him*; For he calleth things that are not, as if they were; 2.

but

but although it be thus with God, yet we are not to conceive of things any other wayes, then according to that manner of his dispensation, whereby things decreed from eternity are produced to act in time; and certainly, as sins future to us are present to him, so repentance also future to us is present to him. And therefore Gods decree for remission, was also for repentance, and both are present to him.

3. 3. This must be granted, *That although future sins are not pardoned before committed, yet by the Covenant of Grace, God will so preserve, that as sins are committed, so grace will be dispensed, that no sin shall actually condemn us.* And this may be the virtual remission of future sins, which some speak of. So that although a justified person may not believe that his sinnes are pardoned, which he shall commit, yet he may believe that God will keep him by his power through faith to salvation, and that if he fall in sin, God will renew repentance in his soul; and our peace of conscience doth not simply arise from hence, That God will pardon our sins, but that he will so preserve us from evil, and lead us into every good duty, that so pardon may be vouchsafed unto us.

The Question held negatively upon these grounds.

These things explained, I come to lay down the Arguments, *Why none should presume, that because of his justification, all future sins not committed, or present sins not repented of, are forgiven unto him.*

1. The first ground is from those places which *presume and necessarily suppose sin to be committed, before it is pardoned.* One place is brought by some learned men, *Rom.* 3.25. *Whom God hath set forth a propitiation, to declare his righteousnesse for the remission of sins that are past.* Here (say they) remission of sins through Christs bloud, is restrained to sins past; and upon this some argue, Therefore future sins are not remitted. Thus, as I take it, argue *Peter Martyr, Hiperius, Downam*; but it is more probable, that by sins past are meant those committed before Christ came into the world. And *Beza*, who is followed by other learned men, make πάρεσιν not to be pardon, but connivence, as if the sense were, God did passe by the sins of our fathers before Christs coming, and did not manifest his wrath in a Sacrifice expiatory of their sins, till Christ himself came

came and ſuffered upon the Croſſe: ſo he makes this ἄφεσις here, with that which is called ἄφεσις, in *Act.* 17.30. Therefore I leave this, and urge one or two more places, 1 *Joh.* 2.1. *If any man ſin, we have an Advocate with the Father.* Here we ſee is interceſſion for ſin, and a way for remiſſion; but how? upon a ſuppoſition that ſin is, *If any man.* Ezek. 18.22. ſpeaking of a wicked man that turneth to God, and now ſhall ſurely live, he expreſſeth it thus; *All his tranſgreſſions that he hath committed ſhall not be mentioned to him.* Obſerve, All that he hath committed, not all that he ſhall commit. A third place is eminently ſet down, *Jer.* 33.8. Where God makes a glorious promiſe of the pardon of ſin; but take notice to what ſins he limits it, even to thoſe that have been committed, *I will cleanſe them from all their iniquity, whereby they have ſinned againſt me, and I will pardon all their iniquities, whereby they have ſinned, and whereby they have tranſgreſſed againſt me.* Its of what they have done, not of what they ſhall do.

A ſecond ſort of Arguments, is *from the expreſſions Gods Word uſeth about pardon*; all which do ſuppoſe, *That ſin goeth before, and that God doth not antidate his pardon.* Such as theſe are, *Remember not iniquity.* Now although this be attributed unto God improperly, yet the very ſenſe of the word ſuppoſeth, that ſins were precedent, and now God by his grace will *remember them no more.* So the phraſe *to blot out*, ſuppoſeth ſin was already regiſtred in Gods Book. Men do not uſe to forgive debts before they be. *Throwing them into the ſea*, what doth this imply? but that ſins did appear before, and that in a terrible threatning manner: *Covering of ſin*, How can that be underſtood, if ſin be not with ſome loathſomneſſe? Thus we might inſtance in all the expreſſions uſed by Scripture to repreſent pardon. 2.

Thirdly, *This truth may be proved from the neceſſary qualifications required in thoſe that have pardon, which cannot be unleſſe a man have already committed the ſin*, as 1 *Joh.* 1.9. *If we confeſſe our ſins, he is faithfull to pardon.* Now confeſſion is alwayes of a thing already extant. How abſurd would it be for a man to go and confeſſe the ſins he will commit? This would rather be impudence then humiliation; look over all the confeſſions made 3.

by the people of God for themselves, or in the behalf of others, as *Davids*, *Ezras*, *Nehemiahs*, *Daniels*, and you shall observe them all limited to sins that have been done, never extended to what they shall commit. Thus in the Old Testament when any had sinned, they offered Sacrifices. There was no Sacrifice appointed for a future sinne, but onely for that which was already committed. Thus to pardon is required *forsaking of a mans sinne*, Prov. 28. 13. Now how can a man be said to forsake that which is not, to leave that which is future? Especially, as you have heard, repentance is commanded as the way wherein only pardon may be had: Now how can repentance be about that which is to come? Can a man repent of any thing but what is past? The two Greek words μετάνοια, to be wise and understand after the fact is done, and ἐπιστροφὴ *reditus*, a turning again to those whom we have offended, make it as clear as the Sunne, that there is no pardon of sinne before committed.

4. Fourthly, *There is no promise in all the Word of God made for the pardon of a sinn before it be committed and repented of.* If therefore the Word of God give no such encouragement, what presumption is it to make a faith, that all sins are pardoned, the Gospel-faith? For grant that such a thing were true, and to be believed, *viz. That all sins are pardoned*, yet that could not be the Gospel-faith, for the Gospel faith is justifying faith: Now the object of justifying faith, is not *ens complexum*, a proposition, such as this is, All my sins are pardoned, but *Ens incomplexum*, a single object, which is Christ himself received and applied by faith: I am not justified by believing my sins are pardoned, but by relying upon Christ for pardon. But this by the way. The strength of the Argument lieth in this, God hath made no promise for the pardon of sin before it be committed and repented of. Therefore none may either believe or claim such a thing. The grand charter or priviledge for pardon, as it is laid down in the Covenant of Grace, is contained in *Jer.* 31.34. which is also repeated, *Heb.* 8.12. Now this Covenant of Grace, as it promiseth pardon of sinne, so also a new heart, and actual exercise of Grace, so that they shall walk in all Gods wayes. Now the way wherein pardon is to be had, is repent-

ance

ance and faith. We muſt not therefore conceive of the Covenant of Grace, as promiſing pardon and forgiveneſſe, without any qualification in the ſubject: This would contradict other places of Scripture. Therefore in the Covenant of Grace ſome things are promiſed abſolutely, ſuppoſing nothing to go before, ſuch are Regeneration, the working of Faith in us, giving his holy Spirit to us, and Union with Chriſt. 2. There are many priviledges in the Covenant of Grace, and thoſe are given, where God hath wrought ſome former effects of his Grace, and ſuppoſe them to be: ſuch are Juſtification, pardon of ſin, increaſe in Grace, Glorification; all theſe things are promiſed in the Covenant of Grace, but made good where there are the former effects of Gods grace wrought in them. We do not therefore ſay, God doth not pardon ſinne, unleſſe repentance go before, as if God needed repentance, as if he could not do it without repentance, as if repentance made God the better, or made him amends. Theſe are idle calumnies caſt upon this Doctrine in ſome Pamphlets. But only God hath appointed one effect of his grace before another in order, and he will not vouchſafe one before he hath wrought the other. As for inſtance, God hath appointed no unclean thing ſhall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, God will not give glory, where he hath not given grace. If one ſhould tragically exclaim upon this, This is to make God need our graces, This is to make grace meritorious with God, this is to be a Papiſt, a Formaliſt, to make men reſt in themſelves, you would perſently judge this a vain, weak cavil: No leſſe is it, when we are charged thus, for holding God will not forgive ſin, but to thoſe that believe and repent. It is not for any worth in what we do, but becauſe God will have an order and a method in his graces, Juſtification where repentance is, Glorification where holineſs is. It being not fit *to give pearl unto ſwine, nor childrens meat to dogs.*

Fifthly, If a man may believe his ſins are pardoned before they be committed, and ſo before repented of, *Then he may have full joy and unſpeakable boaſting in God, while he lieth wallowing in the midſt of ſins.* The reaſon of the conſequence is this, By ſuch an act of faith, we have peace with God, and we glory in 5.

him. This floweth, as a proper effect of faith, though it do not alway follow, yet it may follow, and happily it is our weakneſſe, if it doth not. And if ſo, then it was *Davids* weakneſſe to be troubled about ſin: It was for want of a right conſidering of the Covenant of Grace, that he had no joy in his heart, and that his bones were broken. The Adverſary ſeeth the neceſſity of this conſequent, and therefore is not afraid to ſay, *That a juſtified perſon, even when ſinne is moſt prevalent, and the heart moſt hardened, yet thus can glory in Jeſus Chriſt, with a large heart, breaking forth into thanksgivings, Cornwel of Goſpel-Repentance*, pag. 125. How contrary is this to *Davids* experience, *Pſal.* 32. who, while he humbled not himſelf for his ſin, found nothing but terrour and trouble in his own ſoul? And certainly this Doctrine muſt be very diſtaſtfull to every gracious heart, which ſhall make faith and aſſurance in the glorious effects of it, amicably concording (as it were) with great and grievous ſins. And let the Adverſary ſhew ſuch an inſtance in all Scripture. For as for his example in *Paul*, Rom. 7. who found himſelf captivated unto ſin, doing the things he would not, yet giving thanks to God through Jeſus Chriſt: This is clean contrary to him, for *Paul* did greatly humble himſelf, and was deeply ſenſible of this tyranny of ſin, which made him cry out, *O miſerable man that I am, who ſhall deliver me from this body of ſin?* So that we cannot with any colour call him an hardened ſinner, *Somnium narrare vigilanti eſt*, ſaid *Seneca*; and to complain of ſin, eſpecially in the firſt motions and ſuggeſtions of it, as *Paul* did, argues a tender life of grace in him. No leſſe abſurd is it, to bring *Habakkuk* to patrocinate this great errour; for although he ſaid, *He would rejoyce in God, and glory in his ſalvation*, Hab. 3. 8, 9. in the midſt of Gods judgements upon the publick: yet this doth not ſuppoſe any perſonal grievous ſins he was fallen into.

6. Sixthly, *If ſins be pardoned thus before committed and repented of, then it would be in vain to pray for forgiveneſſe of ſin, ſeeing it is already paſt.* This Argument (as before was ſaid) *Gomarus* urged againſt *Piſcator*, explaining that Petition [*Forgive us our ſins*] for the ſenſe and aſſurance of it only in our hearts. It is true, we may pray for a thing that is paſt, thus far, for the conti-

continuance of it, but not for the thing it ſelf. Although there can hardly be an inſtance in all Scripture given of ſuch a Petition. We do not reade of any prayer in Scripture that God would elect us, and predeſtinate us, yet that might admit of the ſame interpretation which they give for pardon of ſin, *viz.* To make us more aſſured and perſwaded of it in our own hearts. Hence when God ſpeaks of pardon of ſins, he uſeth many times the future tenſe, *Jer.*31. *I will forgive their iniquities*, which if pardoned before, would be very difficult to ſay; even as hard, as if God ſhould ſay, I will predeſtinate and elect ſuch men. It is indeed often ſaid, That when we pray for pardon of ſinne, we pray for the ſenſe and feeling of it; but let ſuch that interpret ſo, give any parallel place for ſuch a ſenſe, yet we deny not (as before hath been ſaid) but reductively this may be included in that Petition.

Seventhly, *If a mans future ſins be already pardoned in a juſtified man, then in a reprobate man, all his future ſins are actually condemned.* The conſequence is firm upon that rule, *Eadem eſt ratio contrariorum*, there is the ſame reaſon of contraries. Therefore if a mans future ſins be pardoned before they be committed, then a reprobate mans ſins ſhall be puniſhed before they be. Now how contrary is this to Gods diſpenſation revealed in the Scripture? Where can we finde any one man puniſhed for a future ſin? Were not all the ſins men are afflicted for in Gods Word, becauſe they had done them, not becauſe they were to do them? Indeed the Scripture, *Matth.*5. ſometimes makes the deſires and luſts of the ſoul after ſin, to be the ſin it ſelf, but that is, becauſe they are the proxime and immediate cauſe of ſuch a ſin; but we are now ſpeaking of future ſins, that it may be as yet have no preparation at all for them in any cauſe. 7.

Eighthly, By what principles the Opponents can prove, *That God pardons ſinnes future*, by the ſame we can prove, *it is becauſe of repentance future.* So that ſtill no ſin will be forgiven without repentance. For ſuppoſe that were a true rule to ſtand upon, Gods internal will to pardon is an immanent act, and therefore from all eternity, will it not as well follow, Gods 8.

internal will to give repentance, is an immanent act, and therefore repentance is from all eternity. If another be a true Rule, That God hath given us all pardon from eternity, only we have the ſenſe of it, and manifeſtation in our own ſouls, May we not then ſay, that we had the grace of repentance from all eternity? But it is declarative in time in our own ſouls. For although Juſtification be Gods act, and repentance ours, yet we are paſſive in the infuſion of this, as well as Juſtification. I ſpeak not of repentance as an act (which cannot ſo properly be ſaid to be infuſed) but of the frame of the ſoul. If a third rule ſhould be true, That therefore ſins are pardoned becauſe the Covenant of Grace ſaith, It will pardon all; Doth not this hold alſo for repentance, ſeeing in the Covenant God promiſeth to give a repenting heart? Laſtly, If God may be thought changeable, becauſe now he pardons, and once he did not, will it not as well hold, becauſe he now gives grace to ſuch a man to repent, and once he did not?

To conclude therefore, it followeth with an equal neceſſity, That if future ſins are forgiven before they be committed, That God alſo did accept of future repentance before it was practiſed; or elſe if repentance be not received by God, till actually performed; ſo neither is ſin forgiven till actually committed and repented of.

Uſe. The reſult of this whole truth is by way of Uſe, To admoniſh us, *That we make not any Doctrine about grace in the* genius *and natural conſequence of it, to encourage or harden to ſin.* If the grace of God, which hath appeared to teach thee *to deny all ungodly luſts,* make thee love them the more: If becauſe you are under grace, ſin hath therefore dominion over you; If there be goodneſſe with the Lord, and therefore you do fear him: then know all things work contrary to their nature, and Scripture-Directions. All Goſpel-grace is a cleanſing, purifying, refining property; it is fire to get out the droſſe; it is water to waſh away the filth; it is oil to mollifie the wounds of the ſoul; it is wine to make the heart glad, and rejoyce in God. Do not while you promiſe your ſelves a liberty by grace, therein become ſervants of corruption; more eſpecially let the children of God, who have had ſweet experience of the Covenant

of

of Grace upon their ſouls, take heed of fals and relapſes. If the Prodigal ſon after that reconciliation made with his father, after all that glory and love vouchſafed to him, had again wandered into far countreys, prodigally conſumed all his eſtate, living with ſwine upon husks, How unpardonable and unworthy would this fact have been? No leſſe guilty wilt thou be, who haſt had the ring put on thee, who haſt fed on the fatted Calf, if after this, thou provoke God by groſſe tranſgreſſions. Some have diſputed, Whether it be poſſible for a godly man to be ſecure in ſinning, and more willing to offend, becauſe of Gods gracious Covenant, which will infallibly reſcue him out of that ſin. But what ſin is not poſſible (except that againſt the holy Ghoſt) even to a regenerate man? Take heed then, leſt thou love the Goſpel, becauſe it hath alwayes glad tidings, and thou canſt not abide the precepts or threatnings, becauſe they ſpeak hard things to thee. *There may be a carnal Goſpeller, as well as a Popiſh Legaliſt.*

Lect. XXIX.

That full Absolution is not untill the Day of Judgement; Wherein Pardon then consists: And whether the Sinnes of Gods People shall be manifested at that Day.

Acts 3. 29.

Repent, and be converted, that your sinnes may be blotted out.

THe Apostle *Peter* in this exhortatory Discourse of his to the Jews, deals like a wise Physician:

1. *Discovering the danger of the disease.*
2. *Applying an effectual remedy.*

The disease is that hainous sinne the Jews were guilty of, in killing of Christ the Prince of life. Which sin is aggravated by a three-fold Antithesis.

1. *They delivered up, and denied Christ in the presence of* Pilate, *when he would have acquitted him.*
2. *They denied him, though he was an holy and just one.*
3. *They desired a murderer to be released rather then him.* This is their sin.

In

In the next place, you have the remedy prescribed in two words, *Repent and be converted*. *Repent*, that denotes a *change in the heart*: and *to be converted*, an *alteration in the outward conversation*, μετανοήτε, However it be generally received that μετανοια signifieth only true and godly sorrow, and μεταμέλεια, that imperfect and unsound grief which is upon hypocrites, yet this is not universally true, for μεταμέλεια, is applied to *true repentance*, Mat. 21. 19. & 32. and μετανοια, word to an *outward repentance* meerly, *Matth.* 11. 21. The other is ἐπιστράφητε, which is to be understood reciprocally, *Turn your selves*, or *be turned*. This exhortation doth not suppose free-will in us, it only denoteth our *duty*, not our *ability*. Neither is *Grotius* his assertion better then *Semipelagianism*, when he compareth the will of a man to the *Mother*, and grace to the *Father*, so that as children are named after the Father, and not the Mother: Thus good actions are denominated from grace, not free-will: for in our conversion free-will is neither a total or partial cause preoperant or cooperant, but the passive subject recipient of that *Vim gratiæ vorticordiam*, as *Austin* called it, the *heart-changing power of grace*. This duty of repentance is urged from the profitable consequent. *Piscator* cals it *effectu utili*, the effect of conversion, which is, *That your sins may be blotted out*. It is not an inference of causality, but of consequence. *Blotting out*, is (as you heard) from Merchants that expunge their debts, or the Scribe that raceth out those letters which ought not to be in the paper, or the Painter that defaceth those lineaments, which should not be in the picture.

In the next place, you have the time, when these sinnes shall be blotted out (that is) when the times of refreshing shall come, ἀναψύξις, is used *Exodus* 8. 15. Some do not understand this, nor that expression, *The times of restitution of all things*, vers. 21. of the Day of Judgement, but of that preservation the Elect should have, when the destruction of *Jerusalem* should be. Hence it is that they expound the day of the Lord so much spoken of in *Peter*, and other places, which is said to be coming upon the believers of that time, when God came to destroy *Jerusalem*, but there is no cogent

reason to go from the received Interpretation; which maketh the *Day of Judgement* to be the times of refreshing to the godly, for so indeed it is, because then they are eased from all those troubles and oppressions they lay under in this world. Hence our Saviour cals it, *The Day of our Redemption*, upon the coming whereof they are to lift up their heads.

The Observation is,

Observ. *That a compleat and full Absolution from all sin, is not enjoyed till the day of Judgement.*

Propositions laid down in prosecution of this Observation.

The believers have not a full discharge till then: we are in this life continually subject to new sins, and so to new guilt, whereby arise new fears, so that the soul hath not a full rest from all, till that final absolution be pronounced at the day of Judgement.

Before we shew the grounds, whereby it may appear, that the remission of our sins is not fully compleated till then: We must lay down some Propositions by way of a groundwork.

1. First, *The Scripture not onely in this priviledge of remission of sinne, but in others also, makes the complement and fulnesse of them to be at the day of Judgement.* Redemption is the *totall Summe*, as it were, of all our mercies, and we are partakers of it in this life, *Col.*1.14. *Rom.* 3,24. Yet the Scripture cals the Day of Judgement, when we shall rise out of our graves in a peculiar and eminent manner, *The day of Redemption*, Ephes.1.7. Ephes 4.30. because at that day, will be the utmost, and last effects of our Redemption. Adoption, that also is a priviledge we receive in this life; yea a learned man (*Forbes* in his Book where he handleth the order of Gods graces) makes Adoption (as I take it) to be the first, and to go before Justification, yet the Apostle, *Rom.* 8. 23. calleth the last day, *The day of Adoption.* Hence (*1 John* 3. 2.) the Apostle, though he saith, *We are now the sonnes of God*, yet he saith, *it doth not appear what we shall be*, because the glory God at the last day will put upon us, is so farre transcendent and superlative to what now we are. Thus *Matth.*19.28. the last day is also called

called *The day of Regeneration to the people of God*, yet in this life they partake of that grace, but becauſe then is the full perfection and manifeſtation of it; Therefore the Scripture cals it, *The day of Regeneration.* Even as the Apoſtle *Act.*13.33. applieth that paſſage of the *Pſalm* to Chriſts Reſurrection, *This day have I begotten thee*, becauſe then was ſuch a ſolemn and publick declaration, that he was the Son of God. No marvel then, if the Scripture do alſo call the day of judgement a time, when ſins ſhall be blotted out, becauſe then is the publick abſolution of the godly; and according to Philoſophy motions receive their names from the term to which they tend.

Secondly, *Howſoever Juſtification be ſaid to conſiſt in pardon of ſinne, yet there is a great difference between the one and the other; For Juſtification, beſides the pardon of ſinne, doth connote a ſtate that the ſubject is put into,* viz. *A ſtate of favour, being reconciled with God.* Hence it is, that this ſtate cannot be reiterated often, no more then a wife after that firſt entrance into the relation is frequently made a wife. In this ſenſe, the Scripture alwayes ſpeaks of it, as connoting a ſtate or condition, the ſubject is put into, as well as a peculiar priviledge vouchſafed to ſuch. It is true, There are indeed learned men, who think Juſtification may be reiterated, as you heard, *Peter Martyr*, and *Bucer.* Others call it a continued action, as conſervation. But although there is a continuance of Juſtification, and the godly are preſerved in that eſtate, yet we cannot ſay, God doth renew Juſtification daily, as he doth pardon of ſin. There are ſome that think the Scripture gives a ground for a ſecond Juſtification, or the continuing and encreaſing of it, and bring thoſe places, *Titus* 3. 5,6,7. *Revel.* 22. 11. The learned and excellent Interpreter *Ludovicus De Dieu* in *Chap.* 8. of the *Romans, verſ.* 4. largely pleadeth for a two-fold Juſtification; The firſt he makes to be the imputing of Chriſts righteouſneſſe to us, received by faith, which is altogether perfect, and is the cauſe of pardon of ſins: The ſecond he makes an effect of the former, whereby through the grace of God regenerating we are conformable unto that

2.

love in part, and are day by day more and more justified, and shall be fully so; when perfection comes: of which Justification he saith these Texts speak, *Jam.* 2. 21, 24. *Revel.* 22. 11. *Matth.* 12.37. 1 *Kings* 8.32. This two-fold Justification, he makes to differ, *toto Cœlo*, from the Papists, whose first is founded upon the merit of Congruity; The second upon the merit of Condignity. But the discussing of this will be more proper in the other Part (*viz.*) of imputed righteousnesse. *Austin* seemeth to hold Justification a frequent and continued Act, (*Lib.* 2. *contra* Julianum, *cap.* 8.) *When we are heard in that Prayer* [*Forgive us our sinnes*] *we need* (saith he) *such a remission daily, what progresse soever we have made in our second Justification.* He speaks also of a Justification *hujus vitæ*, which he cals *minorem* the lesser; and another *plenam* and *perfectam*, full and perfect, which belongs to the state of glory (*Tract.* 4. *in* Joannem, *lib. de Spiritu, & lit. cap. ultim.*) But the more exact handling of this will be in the place above mentioned. It seemeth more consonant to Scripture, if we say, That Justification is a state we were once put into, which is not repeated over and over, as often as sin is forgiven; neither can it admit of increase or decrease, so that a man should be more or lesse justified, for even *David*, while he was in that state of Suspension, was not lesse justified, though the effects of Justification were lesse upon him. It is true, in some sense learned men say, Justification may increase, *viz. extensivè*, not *intensivè*, as they expresse it, by way of extension, when more sins are pardoned, not intensively in its own nature. Even as the soul of a man in its information of the body, admits of no increase intensively, but it doth extensively, the more the parts of the body grow, the further doth its information extend. But of these things more in their proper place.

3. Thirdly, *However an Absolution shall be compleated at the Day of Judgement, yet our Justification shall not abide in such a way, as it is in this life.* Now our Justification is by pardon of sinne, and a righteousnesse without us imputed to us, which is instrumentally applied by faith, but this way shall then cease; for having perfect righteousnesse inherent

in

in our selves, we shall need no covering. It is true, the glory and honour of all this will redound upon Christ, and he shall not be the lesse glorified, because he hath then brought us to the full end of all his sufferings. I know some may doubt, Whether any righteousnesse, but that which is infinite can please God; And therefore (as some think) the Angels were accepted of God through Christ, though perfect: so it may of the Saints in heaven: But I see no ground for this. This seemeth to be undoubted, That the way of Justification by faith in Christ, ariseth, because of our imperfection and sinfulnesse remaining in us, and therefore is *Justificatio viæ*, not *Patriæ*, a Justification of us in our way, not when we come to our home.

Fourthly, Although pardon of sinne be compleated at that great Day, yet this is not to be understood, *as if Gods pardon of any sinne were imperfect, and something of sin did still remain to be done away.* No, those expressions of forgivenesse of sinne in the Scripture, denote such a full and plenary pardon, that a sin cannot be more remitted then it is. But because we commit new sins daily, and so need pardon daily; Therefore it is, that we are not compleatly pardoned till then: As also, because the perfect pardon we have here, shall then solemnly and publickly be declared to all the world. 4.

These things thus premised, I come to shew the grounds or particulars, wherein our pardon of sinne is thus compleated. Wherein the compleatnesse of the pardon of sin at the day of judgement consisteth.

And first, *In our sense and feeling; For howsoever God pardons a sinne perfectly, yet our faith which receiveth it, is weak.* This jewel is taken with a trembling and shaking hand. Hence it is that we have not full faith and confidence in our spirits. We may see this in *David*, though *Nathan* told him his sinnes were forgiven him, yet his faith was not so vigorous and powerful, as wholly to apply this to his own soul; and therefore he had much anguish and trouble of heart afterwards: But now at the last Day, all these fears, diffidence and darknesse, will be quite removed out of our hearts. There shall be no more disturbance in our souls, then there can be corruption in the 1. In our sense of that pardon

highest heavens, we shall then have such a Gourd, as no worm can devour. Our souls shall not then know the meaning of sitting in darknesse, and wanting Gods favour. There will then be no complaints, *Why hath the Lord forsaken me?* Well may Gods children be called upon to lift up their heads, when such a *Redemption draweth nigh*; and well may that day be called *The dayes of refreshment*, seeing the people of God are so often scorched with the fiery darts of Satan.

2. In the accomplishment of all effects of pardon.

Secondly, *Pardon of sinne will at that day be perfected, Because all the effects of pardon, will then be accomplished, and not so much as any scars remain, the wound will be so fully healed.* Although God doth fully pardon sinne, yet the effects of this are delayed, many chastisements and sad afflictions are to be undergone: Howsoever, death it self, and the corruption in the grave must seize upon justified persons; now these are the fruit of sin, and howsoever the sting of these be taken away, yet they are not wholly conquered, till that last day: Then therefore may we justly say, *Sinne is pardoned*, when there shall be no more grave, no more death, no more corruption, but all shall be swallowed up in immortality and glory.

3. Then no more iteration of pardon.

Thirdly, Then, and not till then may we say, *Remission of sinnes will be compleated, Because then shall no more iteration of pardon be.* Here in this life, because the root of corruption abideth in us; there are daily pullulant branches of sinnes, and so frequent guilt is contracted, whereby as we have daily sores, so we need daily plaisters. It is with original corruption in us, as with that tree in *Daniel*, Chap. 4. 14, 15. although the branches be cut off, yet the stump is still in the earth, and that sprouts out too fast by the temptations that are alwayes by it. Hence it is that we alwayes pray, *Forgive us our sinnes*, and because of these failings the Apostle (2 *Cor.* 5.20) writeth to, and exhorteth the godly *Corinthians*, who were already reconciled to God, to be further reconciled to him. But then this Petition shall wholly cease, then there will be no Serpent to sting us, nor will the eye of justifying faith to look upon the brazen Serpent exalt-

ed

ed be necessary any more. The Lord will not only wipe away the tear of worldly grief, but also of godly sorrow at that time. Then, and not till then, will it be true, *That God seeth no sinne in his children.* Then will the Church be *without wrinkles, or any spot within her.* In this respect it is the Church of God prayeth so earnestly for the Bridegrooms coming. For this it is, They look for, and hasten in their prayers that day.

4. Then justification shall be perfected.

Fourthly, At that Day will pardon of sinne only be completed, if you consider *the Nature of Justification. For what is that, but an overcoming the accusing adversary, and clearing of us against every charge?* Now this is most eminently and fully done in those last Assizes. The Syriack word to *Justifie*, is also to *conquer* and overcome, because when a man is justified, he overcometh all those Bils and Indictments which were brought in against him; Now this is manifestly done in the day of Judgement, when God shall before men and Angels acquit and absolve his people; and if the Apostle say in this life, *Rom.6.7.* of a godly man dead in Christ, he is justified from his sins, δεδικαίωται, in respect of Sanctification, that sinne doth not conquer him, but he sinne; how much more will this be true at that Day, when all the guilt and filth of sin shall be totally removed? Oh what a glorious conquest will that be over sinne, hell and the devil, when the Judge of the whole world shall pronounce them free from all sin, and command them to enter into his glorious rest!

Having thus cleared the Doctrine, one Question may be briefly touched upon,

Whether the sins of Gods people shall be manifested at the last Day.

Whether the sinnes of Gods people shall be manifested at the Day of Judgement, and God for Christs sake then acquit them?

There are learned men for the *Affirmative*, They shall be published; and there are learned men for the *Negative*. Those that are for the *affirmative*, they say indeed, godly mens sins shall not be examined for their ignominy or confusion, but only that the goodnesse and grace of God may be made the more illustrious. For this they urge these Arguments,

1. Those

1. Those places of Scripture, which speak of the universality of the real objects, and personal: Of the real; as when its said, *A man must give an account of every idle word*, Mat. 12. 36. 2 Cor. 5. 10 an *account must be made for every thing done in the body*. For the universality of the object personal, 2 *Cor.* 5. *We must all appear before the tribunal seat*.

Again, They urge the opening of the Book, which shall be at that day, and that is nothing, but the manifesting of the consciences of men.

Further, Many wicked mens sins and godly mens are mingled together, and there cannot be a judgement of discussion preceding that of condemnation, unlesse godly mens sins also be produced.

In sum, They think this conduceth more to the setting up of Gods Justice, the exaltation of his mercy; neither (say they) will this breed shame to the godly, for in heaven they shall remember their sins committed on earth, but without any grief or trouble, yea with joy and thankfulnes to God, because delivered from them, *Quandoq; læti recordamur dolorum*, said *Gregory*. We may with joy remember by-past grief.

But those that are for the *negative*, think this no wayes sutable to Gods goodnes, that the sins of the godly should then be published, for these grounds following,

1. From the judicial processe, where Christ cals *the blessed of his Father to inherit the Kingdom prepared for them*; and then enumerateth only the good works they had done; no question they had many sins and failings, but God takes no notice of them.

2. This agreeth best (they say) with those expressions of Scripture concerning pardon, *viz. That God blotteth them out, That they are thrown into the bottom of the Sea.*

3. The godly are said not to come into judgement, and there is no condemnation to them, yea they have already life everlasting.

Lastly, Christ is their Bridegroom, their Friend, their Advocate, and how ill becoming would it be one in such relations to accuse or lay open their sins?

Which of these opinions is truest, is hard to say, neither of them

them have cogent Arguments, and the Scripture doth not expressly decide the Question, yet the negative seems to have more probability on its side.

The Use is, First, *Of Comfort and glad tidings to the children of God, howsoever in this life they have accusations from within, and from without, yet the day is coming, when they shall have a glorious and publick Justification from all Objections*; Then Satan can no more accuse *Joshua* for the noisome rags upon him: Then *Joseph* shall be brought out of the prison freed from all guilt and calumny, and exalted to great glory, and it may be therefore God suffereth thee to be exercised with much guilt and fear here, that thou mayest the more long for those dayes of refreshment. And as this truth is for their great Consolation, so also it demonstrateth their happinesse: That that which is so terrible and dreadfull to wicked men, should be such matter of rejoycing unto them, when they through horrour shall cry for the mountains and hils to cover them, these shall desire the graves and the earth to deliver up her dead, that they may enjoy their Bridegroom. Certainly, believers are not-believers in this point as they should be; What an heavenly contempt would it work in them of this present world? What earnest desires, that this Kingdom might at last come? This is their marriage day, the day of Coronation. Then death, hell, grave, sin and Satan, are all conquered. *Use* 1.

And if the joy and peace, which remission of sin produceth in this life be so exceeding glorious, what will that be when we shall have no more streams but that fountain?

Use 2. By way of contrary, *To terrifie and arouse wicked men*, for as the godly have but a glimmering, a little pittance in this life, in respect of that fulnesse of Glory to be revealed hereafter, so the wicked feel not the least part of that guilt, torment, shame and confusion, which hereafter shall be poured upon them. *Use* 2.

There are many mens sins lie asleep, keep no noise either in their own consciences, or before God; but then these Lions, these masty-dogs that lay tumbling at the door, will rise up in rage, and wholly devour: Do not therefore take Gods for-

bearance for his gracious acquittance; Oh do not imbolden thy self with false incouragements, and say, The worst is over; As the Apostle said, *These light afflictions were nothing to that eternal weight of glory:* So on the contrary may the wicked say, These pangs and wounds of consciences which are felt here, are nothing to that eternal weight of sin hereafter. *Bernard* said, *Descendamus in infernum viventes, ne descendamus morientes,* Let us go into hell while we are alive, by a serious meditation, and holy consideration; that we may not go into it, when we be dead, by real miseries. As the Apostle saith, *We are the children of God, but it doth not yet appear what they shall be;* there is more glory then they can conceive: so wicked men are now the children of wrath, but it doth not yet appear what they shall be. Oh therefore that ungodly men were as wise as *Jonahs* mariners, who in the midst of tempests, seeing their ship necessarily sinking, throw away the goods that were a burden, knowing they and their safety could not consist together. Thus are ye to do, throw away thy sins, those heavy burdens that put all into danger, and so mayest thou safely arrive at last in heaven.

LECT.

Lect. XXX.

Tenderneſſe of Spirit, and true Humiliation, (not carnall Preſumption) the Effect of the Senſe of Pardon.

Luke 7. 47.

Wherefore I ſay unto thee, Her ſins which are many are forgiven her, for ſhe loved much.

THis Text is part of a famous Hiſtory, which may well be called *remarkable*, becauſe of the three great things obſervable in it: 1. Great ſinnes: 2. Great Repentance and Humiliation: 3. Great Love and Grace of God through Chriſt in pardoning: And there is this one peculiar thing well obſerved about this woman in the Hiſtory, that whereas divers others addreſſed themſelves to Chriſt for *corporal* mercies, this only cometh for *ſpiritual*, even for remiſſion of her ſins.

An Entrance into the Text from the conſideration of the Hiſtory.

For the better underſtanding of the Text, let us briefly conſider the Hiſtory. And

Firſt, *The woman is deſcribed by her quality inherent, a ſinner*, not in a common ſenſe as all are, but in a more *notorious* manner: And therefore thoſe that mitigate her fault, out of ſome reverence or honour to her, do not ſo much increaſe *her*

honour, (as *Maldonat* upon the place well obſerveth) as deſirous to *Chriſt's* honour, to the Phariſaick ſkill moſt commended, where the diſeaſe is more deſperate. That ſhe was a *known great ſinner*, appeareth, in that the Phariſee wondered at Chriſt, becauſe he would have any commerce with her. Whether this woman was *Mary*, *Lazarus* his ſiſter or no, is hotly diſputed by Commentators, but impertinent to my ſcope.

In the next place, You have her great Repentance expreſſed, wherein for the generall, you may ſee the Apoſtles Duty accompliſhed, *As ſhe had given her members to be ſervants of iniquity, ſo now of righteouſneſſe*. Inſomuch that ſhe is the true Looking-Glaſſe of an humble Convert.

Her Humiliation is deſcribed:

1. In bringing of a Box of Ointment to anoint his feet; not his head (ſay ſome) becauſe ſhe thought her ſelf ſo unworthy, ſhe brought indeed an outward *viſible box* of Ointment, but ſhe had another *inviſible and ſpiritual one*, even a contrite and broken heart.

2. She ſtands behinde Chriſt (as being loathſome in her own eyes) *And waſheth his feet with her tears*; which muſt ſuppoſe that to be true in her, which *Jeremiah* deſireth, *viz.* her *head to be a fountain of water*, but as long as her heart was ſuch a *fervent limbeck*, it was no wonder to ſee ſuch precious diſtillations: *Chryſologus* upon this fact of hers, ſaith, *The Heavens are wont to water the Earth with rain*; but *Ecce hinc rigat terra Cœlum*. Here the Earth watereth Heaven.

Laſtly, The debaſement of her ſelf, further appeareth, in making her hair, heretofore the inſtrument of her pride and wantonneſſe, now a *towel* to wipe his feet.

An Humiliation from the Teares, the confideration of the Hairs.

In the third place, Chriſts love towards her is remarkable, and in the generall it is ſo great, that the Phariſee puffed up with his own pride, was *offended* at it, not conſidering:

Firſt, That though ſhe had been a ſinner, yet now ſhe manifeſted Repentance.

And

And secondly, That every commerce and communion with a sinner is not forbidden, but that which is of incouragement or consent unto his sinne. Like our Saviour will like the communion of a Physician with the patient, to heal and cure. Hence our Saviour touched the Leper, whom he healed, yet was not unclean, because he touched him to restore him to health: But as the people murmured, because *Moses* married a Blackmore, so the Pharisees grudged because Christ shewed mercy to sinners, but *Moses* indeed could not make the Blackmore white, whereas Christ doth purifie the defiled soul.

Now our Saviour doth aggravate his love to her,

1. By a diligent enumeration of those several acts of service, which she had exhibited to him, not mentioning any of her former sins, and all this he doth with an *antithesis*, or opposition to that carriage which the Pharisee had presented him with.

2. To convince the Pharisee, he declareth a Parable, that so from his own mouth the Pharisee may judge her love to Christ to be greater then his.

In the last place, his grace to her is further declared, by pardoning her sins though so hainous, which pardon is first declared unto the Pharisee in my Text, and afterwards to the woman her self.

In my Text is the first promulgation of her pardon, now because the words have some difficulty, and the later part is brought to prove love to be a meritorious cause of remission of sins: Two Questions are briefly to be resolved.

Two Questions resolved for clearing the Text.

1. *When this womans sins were pardoned?*

Answ. And the Answer is, *Then as soon as ever she repented in her heart of her evil wayes, and believed in Christ, her sinnes were forgiven her*; for so God doth promise, and this was before she came to Christ, but she cometh to Christ for the more assurance of pardon, and not only so, but that he should authoritatively absolve her from her sinne; for Christ did more then declare her sins pardoned, as appeareth by the standers by, who with wonder made this Question, *Vir.* 49. *Who is this that forgiveth sinnes also?* Whereas to declare the forgivenesse of sin only, any Minister may do, we read of

Nathan to David, 2 Sam. 12. 13. so that her sins were pardoned by God before, at the first time of her faith and repentance, but now Christ, as the Mediator, doth particularly absolve her, and that in her own conscience, therefore he bids her, *Go in peace.*

1. When this Penitents sin was pardoned. 2. Whether the expression in the Text favor any causality in the Penitents love in reference to her pardon.

The second Question is, *Whether that expression* [Much is forgiven, for she loved much] *be causall, as if her love were antecedent, and a cause of her Forgivenesse: or consequentiall only, as an effect, or signe of her Forgivenesse: In this sense,* She loved much, *because God did forgive her many sinnes, not* she loved much, *and therefore God forgave her.*

Here is a great and vast difference between these two: Many Papists are for the latter, the Protestants generally for the former; and there is this cogent reason for it, for that Christ doth not speak of repentance, or love which should go before, and be the cause of the pardon of sinnes, is plain by the Parable he brings of a Creditor, who forgave one Debtour more, another Debtour lesse: Hereupon our Saviour asked the Pharisee, *which of them will love him most? Simon answered, I suppose him to whom most was forgiven:* Now of such a love our Saviour speaketh, when he mentioneth the woman, which is clearly a love of *gratitude, because much was forgiven*; not an antecedent love of *merit*, to procure pardon; so that as from her actions of anointing and washing his feet, by way of a *signe or effect*, we gather her faith and love of Christ; so by her faith and love, as by a *signe and effect*, it may be gathered, that her sinnes are forgiven her. But you may ask, How could she come to know her sins were forgiven before Christ told her? I answer, By the promise of God made to every true penitent and believer: Though this assurance of hers was imperfect, and therefore admitted of further degrees; whereas then all this repentance and humiliation was not, *That sinne might be forgiven*, but from faith that they *were forgiven*. We may observe this,

Observ. 1. *That the sense and apprehension of pardon of sinnes already obtained, doth not beget carnall security, but a further*

that mollifying and humbling of the heart in a gracious manner.

This is a practical truth of great concernment. And for the opening of it, take notice of this distinction, as a foundation, (*viz.*) That there is in Scripture a two-fold repentance or humiliation of the soul for sinne; The one *antecedent* and going before pardon, and this the Scripture requireth as a necessary condition, without which forgivenesse of sinne cannot be obtained: of this repentance the Scripture for the most part speaks, *Ezek.* 14. *v.* 18, 30. *Matth.* 3. 2. *Mark* 6. 12. *Luke* 13. 3. *Act.* 3. 19. and generally in most places of Scripture. A two-fold repentance in Scripture.

In the second place, There is an humiliation of heart, and brokennesse of soul for sinne, arising *from the apprehension of Gods love in pardoning, whereby we grieve that we should deal so unkindely with so good and gracious a God*: This though more rarely, yet is sometimes spoken of in Scripture, as first in this woman, who out of the apprehension of Gods love in pardoning so much to her, did pour out her soul in all waies of thankfulnesse. After this manner also was *Davids* repentance, *Psalm* 51. for he was thus deeply affected after *Nathan* had told him, *His sinne was taken away*: Although it doth appear by the *Psalm* also, that he had not as yet that sense of pardon, which did quiet his conscience. This kinde of affection was also in *Paul*, 1 Tim. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. 1 Cor. 15. 8, 9. in which places the Apostle remembring his former sins, confesseth them, and acknowledgeth thereby his unworthinesse of all that grace and favour he had received; so that the Apostle doth not there humble himself that he may obtain mercy, but because he had obtained mercy. The most eminent instance of this kinde of sorrow and shame, is *Ezekiel* 16. 62, 63. where God promiseth to establish his Covenant with them; and then mark the event of this, *Then thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth more because of thy shame, when I am pacified towards thee.*

So then, both these kindes of humiliations are to be owned and practised; and therefore it is a false and dangerous errour,

errour, to acknowledge no other kinde of repentance then the latter: The Papists will not acknowledge this latter humiliation at all, because they deny all Faith and Assurance that a believer may have of his sinnes in particular: And others, That there is only this latter, and therefore the fore-mentioned Authour, in his Treatise of *Gospell-Repentance*, makes this only Gospel-Repentance: But as Gospel-Faith is not that reflect act of the soul in a man, whereby it is perswaded that Christ is his, but a direct act of taking and receiving Christ to be ours; so a Gospel-Repentance is not that mainly whereby we are humbled, because we receive Gods love to us in pardoning, but principally in that loathing of our selves to obtain pardon. It is therefore great ignorance in that Authour, in his Treatise of *Gospel-Repentance*, when *pag.* 38. he cals Repentance that goeth before this Faith, (*viz.*) that my sins are pardoned, a dead work; as if the Faith that justifieth, and without which it is impossible to please God, were the believing that my sinnes are pardoned; whereas the Scripture makes it to be, the receiving of Christ, and laying hold on him: And seeing that the object must in order of nature be before the act that is imployed about it, it followeth infallibly, That I must have Justification, before I can believe I have it. Repentance therefore may be thought to go before a two-fold act of Faith; First, That whereby Christ is laid hold upon, and made ours; and so the Repentance that precedeth this, may be called legal and slavish. Or secondly, Before a perswasion that my sinnes are pardoned, and before this act of Faith, Repentance must necessarily go, because the Covenant of Grace dispenseth pardon only to such.

But because I have already spoken enough of the former kind of Repentance, anteceding remission of sins, vindicating the necessity of it; I shall presse upon this latter, as being most proper to my Text, *And that Assurance of apprehension of pardon doth not beget security, but rather increase godlinesse*, will appear several wayes.

The Observation proved from Scripture

And first thus: Those places which speak of Gods gracious Properties, do represent them as *Grounds of Duty*,

as

as well as of Consolation, Psalm 130. 4. *There is forgiveneſſe with thee, that thou mayeſt be feared*: Mark that expreſſion [*There is forgiveneſſe with thee:*] which implieth forgiveneſſe to be in God, as in a *Fountain*: and therefore he doth eaſily, and plentifully forgive; but leſt any Spider ſhould ſuck poiſon out of this ſweet flower, he addeth, *That thou mayeſt be feared*; here is no encouragement to ſecurity. Thus *Hoſea* 3. 5. there is a gracious promiſe of God to his children, that they ſhall fear him and his goodneſſe. As it is Gods glorious property to work good out of evil, ſo it is a moſt deviliſh quality to work evil out of good.

Secondly, The *Promiſes of God*, they alſo require *an holy and humble walking*, 2 Cor. 7. 1. The Apoſtle having in the Chapter before, mentioned thoſe glorious promiſes in the Covenant of Grace, that he would be our God, and we his ſons and daughters, makes this inference, *Having thoſe Promiſes, let us cleanſe our ſelves from all filthineſſe, perfecting holineſſe in the fear of God*; So that here is no danger, as long as we keep cloſe to the genuine uſe of the Scripture. Thus alſo *Epheſ.* 4. 30. *Grieve not the Spirit of God, whereby ye are ſealed, &c.* Where *Aſſurance* is ſo far from *encouraging* to ſin, that by ſin it is weakned and deſtroyed. The more gracious then we perceive God to us, the more humiliation and debaſement we finde in our ſelves. Thus the Apoſtle *Peter*, 1 Pet. 1. 17. *If ye call on the Father, who without reſpect of perſons, judgeth all men, paſſe the time of your ſojourning here without fear.* To make therefore doubting a duty, and meritorious, as ſome Papiſts have done, is to betray great ignorance of Scripture motives.

Thirdly, *That aſſurance of pardon is apt to kindle ſpiritual affections*, is plain, *if you conſider the Nature of ſuch aſſurance.* By Reaſon.

First, Originally it is wrought by the Spirit of God, as a man by the power of free-will, is not able to doe any ſupernaturall good thing, ſo neither by the ſtrength of naturall light, can he diſcern the gracious priviledges God beſtoweth upon him, 1 *Cor.* 2. 12. The Spirit 1.

whereby *we know the things that are freely given us of God*, is opposed to the *Spirit of the world*: If then this perswasion be not the fruit of the flesh, but of the Spirit, Is it any wonder, that it inclineth us to holy things? Again,

2. Secondly, This perswasion of pardon cometh *in the use of those means appointed by God*, 2 Pet. 1. 10. By giving great *diligence in the use of the means*, we only come to *assurance*. How then can such a *perswasion of forgivenesse* cause a *neglect of the means*?

3. Lastly, That Spirit which doth thus assure, doth work also at the same time, concomitant gracious effects, especially fervent and effectual prayer, *Rom.* 8. *Gal.* 5. Now where constant powerfull prayer is, that soul is like *a tree planted by the waters side*.

Further evidence from experience. Fourthly, That this perswasion of pardon doth inflame much to holinesse, appeareth *from the nature and state of those who are in it, They are sons*. Now by experience we see, that in an ingenuous son, the more apprehension there is of his fathers tender love and kindenesse to him, the more obsequious and serviceable he is; Can we think that the fathers great love to his Prodigal son was not like coles of fire poured on him to melt and thaw him? We rather see jealousies and suspitions of love to breed hatred at last. Hence diffidence worketh despair, and despair hatred of God. It is therefore a special duty lying upon the people of God, to entertain good thoughts of God, and to be perswaded of his loving kindnesse to them.

Fifthly, That the people of God do yet mourn and abhor themselves for their sins, though perswaded of the pardon of them, ariseth *from the sincerity and uprightnesse of their heart, whereby they hate sin as sin, and grieve for the dishonour they have put upon God*. It is indeed lawfull, yea a duty to repent of sin, that it may be pardoned, because the Scripture propounds this as a motive and encouragement to the duty. And it is a vain thing, to affect more high and spiritual strains then the Scripture. But humiliation of sin, when pardoned, and after the knowledge of the pardon, doth evidently discover an upright heart, that the dishonour of God is more trouble and grief to

him,

him, then his own punishment and destruction, whereby it is, that he doth so accuse and condemn himself for dealing so wretchedly and frowardly with so gracious a God.

Sixthly, That ingenious principle of gratitude and thankfulnes which reigneth in the godly, wil put them upon all these services. Godlines in the lives of the godly may be considered two wayes, 1. As a means wherein they attain to eternal life. 2. As an expression of thankfulnesse unto God. Hence *Ursine* in his Catechism, inscribeth that part of Divinity which containeth our duty, *de gratitudine*, of thankfulnesse. *Bern.* Epist. 107. *Justus quis est, nisi qui amanti se Deo vicem rependit amore? quod non fit nisi revelante spiritu per fidem eternum Dei propositum de sua salute?* Who is a righteous man but he that returneth love to God for Gods loving of him? And how can this be, but by Gods Spirit revealing his purpose of Election, concerning the just mans salvation?

Use of Instruction. Doth the apprehension of great pardon breed great humiliation, then we may see the necessity of that Ministry and preaching, which doth discover the depth, length and breadth of sin. They take the best way to set up grace, and magnifie Christ, who do amplifie the polution of sin in us. Now that we may come to be convinced how much God doth forgive us, two points are much to be insisted upon.

Use 1.

To presse this Use upon us, two things especially to be insisted upon.

1. *The Doctrine of original corruption, for thereby we shall see our selves guilty of more sin then ever we thought of.* A man without the Scripture light is like one in a dark dungeon, which is full of Serpents, Toads, and all venemous creatures, but is not able to see any of them, and so thinks himself without any danger at all. If therefore thou wouldest see how much is forgiven, reckon up all the debts thou owest. The mercy and skill of the Physician will then appear, when the worst of thy disease is made manifest.

1. The Doctrine of original corruption.

A second point much to be pressed is, *The pure, strict and exact obligation of the Law, which being set as a pure glasse before thee, all thy deformities will appear.* In this sense it is good to be a legal Preacher, and a legal hearer often: that so knowing the holinesse of the Law, and our imperfection, we may esteem the more of Gods grace in pardoning so much; As God in the

2. The strict obligation of the Law.

outward paſſages of his providence, doth therefore ſuffer one trouble to follow another, like ſo many waves, that ſo the greater their calamities have been, his wiſdom, power and goodneſſe may be the more conſpicuous in delivering of them. Thus it is alſo in his ſpiritual adminiſtrations, he will not reveal the riches of grace, but to the poor in ſpirit, nor will he give eaſe and refreſhment, but to thoſe that are heavy laden and burdened. And this is the reaſon why a Phariſee, a Formaliſt, a moral man, a ſelf-righteous man, doth not love Chriſt, as converted Publicans and ſinners do.

Uſe 2. *Uſe* 2. *Of Admonition*, to thoſe who have ſinned much, and ſo have had much forgiven them, let ſuch know their expences of practiſed grace, muſt be according to the receits of juſtifying grace. Let ſuch know, the pardon of many ſins is a talent to be greatly improved. As thou haſt abounded in many ſins, and God in many pardons, ſo do thou in much thankfulneſſe. How thankfull would we be to a man who hath delivered us often from a temporal death! But behold a greater love is manifeſted here. Thou who haſt (it may be) been the chiefeſt ſinner of many thouſands, be now the chiefeſt believer of many thouſands; If thou haſt been a great ſinner, and art not now a great actor, and ſpiritual merchant, negotiating for God, fear the truth of thy grace; much love ſhould be like much fire that conſumes all droſſe; quicken up thy ſelf with ſuch thoughts as theſe, Lord, who was more plunged into ſin then I? Whoſe diſeaſes were greater then mine? It may be thouſands and thouſands for leſſe and fewer ſins then I have committed, are now taking their portion in hell. O Lord, this thy overflowing goodneſſe doth overcome me! Oh that I had the hearts of all men and Angels to praiſe thee!

FINIS.

THE TABLE.

A

FIve *Absurdities* objected by the Antinomians, which (they say) will follow from the doctrine that God afflicts his people for sin, vindicated. 42

What kinde of *act* forgiveneſſe is, and whether it be antecedent to our faith and repentance. 185

There are no *Accidents* in God. *ibid*

How *afflictions* come upon the godly after pardon of sin. 27

God doth not alwayes *afflict* with reference to sin. 28

The *afflictions* of the godly are not legal, but evangelical, and why. *ib.*

How *afflictions* on believers agree with the justice of God. 109

It is a great *aggravation* to the sins of Gods people, that they have been committed in his sight. 58

Aggravations and diminutions of sin. 226

The unsound answers of the *Antinomians* about the afflictions of the godly. 46

The *Antinomians* answer to, and evasion of certain Scriptures, answered. 59

How the *anger* of God is shewed toward the sinnes of his people. 81

Arguments proving, that God doth see sin in the justified so as to be offended with it. 59

Seven *Arguments* proving our faith and repentance antecedents of Justification. 189

Three Reasons proving that *Assurance* of pardon is apt to kindle spiritual affections in us. *ibid.*

B

SIns committed after *Baptisme* pardonable. 136

Christ is the Advocate of *Believers* after Justification. 71

How sin is a *blot* in the soul. 145

C

A Three-fold *Cause* of Justification { Efficient. Meritorious. Instrumental. } 3

The people of God are not *cast* off for their sins. 256

It is one thing to *change* the will, and another to will a change. 214

It is no derogation from *Christ*, that sin is in a believer. 44

What the bloud of Christ doth meritoriously *cleanse*, the Spirit doth efficaciously. 82

Wherein the *completenesse* of the pardon of sinne at the day of judge-

ment consists. 280
A two-fold *condition* of faith. 211
Pardon of sin is a *continued* act. 112
What is meant by *covering* sinne. 237
How sin being in the regenerate, yet *covered*, will stand with the Omniscience, Truth and Holinesse of God. 232
Whether God doth see sin when he hath *covered* it. 234

A

ETernal *Death* deserved by every sin. 228
What in sin is a *debt*. 113
Sins called a *debt* in a fourefold respect. 114
There is a great *difference* between original and actual sin, and wherein they differ. 23
There is great *difference* in the calamities of the godly. 32
The afflictions of the godly and wicked, how *differ*. 33
The *difference* between a godly man troubled in conscience, and a man damned in hell. 88
A twofold *difference* between actions immanent and transient. 185
An elect person and a reprobate, how they are { alike. / *differ*. } 209
Whether a *difference* ought to be made between great and little sins. Six Propositions clearing the same. 228
A Christian is to make a *difference* of sin. *ibid.*
A threefold *difference* between the sinnes of a godly and wicked man. 253
Seeing and knowing, how they *differ*. 98
No *difference* to our capacity between Gods seeing and knowing 100
A twofold *difference* between Gods forgiving our sins, and our forgiving others. 121
The properties of God, and the actions of them, how they *differ*. 105
Justification and pardon of sin, how they *differ*. 284
The sense of Gods *displeasure* for sin, may be retained in us two wayes, servilely, filially. 25

E

Election is *amor ordinativus non collativus*. 280
In what sense an *elect* man before conversion is loved of God. *ibid.*
God hath other *ends* then to satisfie his justice, when he afflicts his people. 29
The ground of Popish *errors* about justification. 6
The *errours* of Papists and Antinomians concerning remission of sin 48
The *errours* of the Saints displeasing to God. 86
Why Creation and Justification are not from *eternity*. 186

F

HOw the word *face* is attributed to God. 207
A twofold *faith* in all petitions, applicative, fiducial. 66
All men called *flesh*. 5
Forgivenesse is the removing the guilt, though not the nature of sin. 49
Prayer for, and faith in God for *forgivenesse*, may well stand together. 67

God doth reiterate *forgiveneſs* of ſin. 136
Chriſtians ought to pray for *forgiveneſſe*, and in what ſenſe. 121
Forbearance of puniſhment differs from *forgiveneſs*. 153
What *forgiveneſſe* of ſinne is. 237
Whether God in *forgiving* ſinne, doth forgive all ſinne together. 169
The meaning of the Petition, *Forgive us our debts*, declared in eight particulars. 221
How *freedom* is extended to God. 105

G

THe *glory* of God, what. 2
The nature of *Goſpel-grace*. 278
Great ſins as well as leſſer are forgiven the godly. 56
Groſs ſins procure wrath to the godly 230
Groſs ſins exclude from the ſociety of the Church. 231
Groſſe ſins require many conditions before pardoned. *ibid.*
Groſſe ſins require a more intenſe act of faith to apply pardon. 232
A godly man falling into *groſſe* ſins is under ſequeſtration, though not ejection. 262
Why the *guilt* of new groſs ſins doth not take away Juſtification. 168

H

Hay and ſtubble, 1 *Cor.* 3. what. 87
A Chriſtian is to be *humbled* more for groſſe ſinnes then ordinary infirmities. 230

I

THe act of *Impetration*, and the ground of it, how they differ. 204
There is a twofold *impulſive* cauſe of juſtification. 1
Juſtification what it *implieth*. 6
How *Infants* are juſtified; whether without faith or no. 200
How Chriſt is *in* us, and *we in* him. 203
How ſin is *injurious* to God. 183
God cannot in *Juſtice* but punish ſinners. 106
The *Juſtice* of God, a miſs of a Surety. 109
The *Juſtice* of God eſſentially *ad intra*, and the effects *ad extra*, how differ. *ibid.*
A man is not *juſtified* until he doth repent and beleeve. 43
How we *are juſtified* before faith. 196
Wherein *Juſtification* conſiſts. 18
How *Juſtification* can be ſaid to be the pardon of ſin. *ibid.*
Whether the *Juſtification* of beleevers be the ſame under the Old and New Teſtament. 67
Juſtification and faith are correlatives 202
Four Propoſitions ſhewing the nature and time of a beleevers *Juſtification*. 283
Juſtification is not reiterated. 112

K

GOds *knowledge* and ours how they differ. 132

L

How Gods taking notice of sin to punish it, is subject to the meer *Liberty* of his will. 103
God takes notice of *little* sins. 89

M

Whether the sins of Gods people shall be *manifested* at the last day. 288
The Spirit doth *mortifie* our sinnes. 61
External and spiritual *mortification*, how differing. 62
Sinne is *mortified* in us not onely declaratively but really. *ibid*

N

The *Nature* of Justification. 125
The *Nature* of sin, what, and how expressed in Scripture. 139
The *nature* of the sins of Gods people 254
God takes *notice* of the sins of beleevers. 65,137

O

An *Obligation* to punishment follows sin. 147
False *opinions* liable to the anger of God proved. 86,87
Habitual *original* sinne how truly it may be called sin. 139
The *Orthodox* truth concerning afflictions upon a justified person, against the errours of Antinomians and Papists. 28

Pardon. Heb. words for 5
— Greek 20.
— what — p. 144
— 226

Pardon of sin is not only privative but positive. 226
Five Reasons proving that the sense of *pardon* doth not beget carnal security. 292
Five Reasons why God doth sometimes *pardon* sin, and not manifest it to the soul. 221
Whether the sins of beleevers be *pardoned* before they be committed. 272
Our sins are perfectly *pardoned* in this life. 284
Whether God by his absolute power may not *pardon* sinne without the graces of faith and repentance. 160
Peace with God, what it is. 38
Whether in that *Petition* Mat. 5.12. we pray for pardon and assurance. 224
Four Reasons proving that not onely assurance, but the pardon it self is to be *prayed* for. 220
ἁγιασμὸς, what it signifieth. 2

Q

There is a twofold *Quickning*. 197

R

When we receive the fulnesse of *remission* of sin. 283
Remission of sinne is such a taking it away as if it had never been. 47
How the Papists and Antinomians do agree and differ concerning *Remission*. 49
Remission of sin what, declared in six Propositions. 149
Remission of sin is not onely *ablativa* mali

mali, but collativus boni. 154
Remission of sinne how obtained. ibid.
Why repentance and faith is urged as necessary to remission. 155
Eight Propositions declaring how repentance being our duty may stand with free-grace in the remission of sin. 156
When God remits sinne he gives repentance. 159
How repentance is necessary to remission of sin. 160
Two extreams in repentance confuted 162
Gods free grace and mans duty of repentance may be reconciled. 166
Repentance, why required. 169
God doth indispensably require repentance in all. 168
Six Reasons of congruity between Remission of sin and repentance. 169
Perfect repentance cannot take away the guilt of sin. 180
A two-fold repentance. 292
Why repentance is not as great a good as sin is an evil. 182
Imputed righteousnesse a more solid ground of comfort then the most perfect and exact inherent righteousnesse, and why. 11

S

The full Satisfaction of Christ to God, takes not away the precedency of faith and repentance to Justification. 208
How Christ satisfied Gods wrath. 209
In what relation Christ satisfied God 109
The Question, Whether repentance of it self may not take away sin, answered three ways. 182
God seeth and is angry with the sins of his people. 248
How God can see sin in the beleevers when they have the righteousnesse of Christ to cover them. 242
Rules concerning God seeing sin in a beleever. 50
Sins may be said to be pardoned five ways. 21
What it is to have sin forgiven. ibid.
No sin hath a positive natural being. 44
Sins forgiven are as if they had never been. 55
God is affected with the sins of his people. 73
Sins of the godly { alike. / and ungodly how they are differ. } 79
The most eminent sanctified person hath sin in him. 129
Every sin hath a double weight { punishment. / offence to God. } 133
We may ask pardon for great sins. 134
Sin and the effects of sin what. 139
Habitual sin forbidden by the Law. 142
A man cannot intend sin formally. 143
There is in every sin the { Macula, / Reatus. } 145
Two things considerable in every sin in it self. 147
Sins continue untill pardoned. 146
Two things considerable in sin relating to Justification. 155
Whether sin be an infinite evil. 247
There are degrees in sin. 248
The sin of David aggravated by ten circumstances. 248
No sin, though never so great for nature, (except the sinne against the ho-

holy Ghost) but the godly may fall into it. 253
In what sense the *sins* of the godly are reigning sins. 255
How farre grosse *sins* make a breach upon Justification. 258
Why *sins* are called debts. 122
Whether God may not by his absolute Soveraignty adjudge man to eternal misery with consideration of *sin*. 19,30

T

SPiritual *Theft*, what. 78
Threatnings applied to beleevers. 77
There is a two-fold *trouble* for sinne. 45
Not to *trust* to repentance. 184

U

WHether we be *United* to Christ before Justification. 202
How all sin is *voluntary*. 141
God doth sometimes *upbraid* his people. 76

W

THere is no new *Will* in God. 186,213
Five *words* used in Scripture to expresse Justification. 24
The severall *words* used in Scripture to expresse forgiveneſſe of sin. 143
The *Word* preached and written differ not essentially. 93
Words used in Scripture to declare remission of sin. 148
The effects of Gods *wrath* upon his own children, how considered. 75

FINIS.

THE True Doctrine OF JUSTIFICATION

ASSERTED & VINDICATED From the Errours of many,

and more especially

PAPISTS and SOCINIANS.

OR

A TREATISE of the Natural Righteousness of GOD, and Imputed Righteousness of CHRIST.

By ANTHONY BURGESSE Pastor of the Church at *Sutton-Coldfield* in *Warwickshire*.

AUG. de bono Perseu. in fine.

Qui errare me existimant, etiam atque etiam diligenter quæ sunt dicta considerent, ne fortassis ipsi errent. Ego autem cum per eos qui meos labores legunt, non solum doctior, verum etiam emendatior fio, propitium mihi Deum agnosco: & hoc per Ecclesiæ Doctores maximè expecto, si & in ipsorum manus veniunt, dignentur, posse quæ scribo.



London, Printed for *Thomas Underhill*, at the Anchor and Bible in *Pauls* Church-yard, 1654.



TO THE JUDICIOUS READER.

READER,

THE Wisemans Divine Observation, mentioned *Eccles.* 12. 12. may justly put any man to some pause and deliberation, that is publishing Books to the world, for two discouragements are there spoken of; and if *Solomon* acted by the holy Spirit thought good to say so much in those dayes, what would he say to the multitude of Books that since have filled the world?

The first Discouragement is the endless number of Books, and this is especially true in Polemical Discourses, for there *bellum è bello nascitur*, one controversie doth not end, but beget another, as one Circle in the Water produceth another. And the second is, the wearisomness,

riſomneſs that much ſtudy or reading bringeth to the fleſh; ſo that it is like *Pauls worldly ſorrow that cauſeth death*; yea this is not the worſt; for Books, eſpecially controverſal, do produce wearineſs even to the ſpiritual part of a man, and do exceedingly *diſpirit* and *hebetate* the vigorous actings of the ſoul in a practical gracious manner.

Now theſe Conſiderations would have prevailed with me, not to have troubled the world with ingratefull Controverſies, but that formerly an obligation lay upon me to finiſh this Work, to which alſo I have been often ſollicited by worthy and learned Friends; neither will that Objection of deading and dulling the affectionate part, hold much in this Debate, for it being wholly buſied to advance Chriſt both in what he did and ſuffered, as in reference to us; hereby not onely the Truth will gain upon the Underſtanding, but the goodneſs of it exceedingly ſweeten, and raviſh the Affections: So that we may ſay, *Out of this ſtrong one, comes meat*, and who ſo will ſeriouſly walk in this ſtudy ſhall finde it not a barren Wilderneſs where are only briars and thorns, but a Land flowing with milk and honey.

The principal and main Truth aſſerted in this Book, is the Imputation of Chriſts Active Obedience, as well, and in the ſame manner as his Paſſive in the matter of Juſtification, and that as a Believer is not to divide the Natures, or the Offices of Chriſt; ſo neither his Obedience in this great work of our Redemption. A Doctrine that doth openly and plainly proclaim more honour to Chriſt,

and

and more comfort to the truly humbled ſinner, then any of its Competitors. And therefore at firſt Reformation out of Popery, generally received by all the Learned and Godly Proteſtants, and as ſtrongly oppoſed and argued againſt by all the Popiſh Writers, who concluded it to be the known and avouched Doctrine of the Proteſtants: But afterwards it came to be doubted of, and at laſt to be decried and denied, when on the contrary ſome Papiſts began to cloſe with it.

Now the Oppoſers of this imputed Righteouſneſs, as it relateth to Chriſts Active Obedience, go upon different Principles.

Some (as the *Socinians*) do ſo deny it, that they raze the very Foundation it ſelf, and at the ſame time take away the Imputation of Chriſts Paſſive and Active Obedience, making both to be a meer humane figment, abhorring from all Reaſon.

Others (as the Papiſts) admit in ſome ſenſe the Imputation of Chriſts ſufferings, but ſpend their whole ſtrength againſt the Imputation of his Righteouſneſs, as if in that we were to be Juſtified.

Among the Proteſtants there are ſome eminent and Learned men, who have alſo been for the Negative, *viz.* the *Non*-Imputation of Chriſts Active Obedience, as the matter of our Juſtification; though the number for the Negative, is nothing equal to the number for the Affirmative. Its not my purpoſe to paſs ſuch a ſevere Condemnation upon the Opinion of the Diſſentients, as I ſee ſome learned men do (although the Doctrine aſſerted in this Book is heavily branded, as being the ſeed of Antinomia-

nism, and endangering both Law and Gospel, by such who are of a contrary Judgement) but rather am grieved publickly to manifest a difference from such who are eminently usefull in the Church of God. But cordial Esteem and Reverence may be to those, from whom Truth (as we judge) doth necessitate us to dissent. If any of the learned Opposers of the Opinion herein affirmed shall condescend so low, as to confute the Arguments propounded in this Treatise; If I am not convinced by the Light they bring, I shall think it a Duty still to maintain the interest of this so precious and wholesome a Truth. But Experience may teach us, That though Learning and Understanding will enable us to confirm true Doctrine, yet onely Grace and holy Meekness of Spirit, doth fit us for the right managing of it: Therefore because in Replies, we are prone to discover our nakedness, and to strive for a Doctrine more, as it is our Opinion, and as we are concerned in it, rather then as it is the Lords Truth, who as he needeth not our lie, so neither our passions; I do think it the most profitable and peaceable way, to propound and propugne the Doctrine *in Thesi*, and whatsoever Arguments are brought against it, nakedly to examine them, without Replies to a whole Book or Discourse that happily may be published by the Opponent: For what Reader doth not see, that such Contests are spent in personal reflections, in verbal mistakes, and conduce very little to any mans Edification? Truth being seldom more cleared by those whose Disputations are *in pugno*, and *Syllogismi in calcibus*, as *Hierom* once said of some.

some in his time. Hereby also there are more Interpretations upon Interpretations, and Books upon Books, then upon the Doctrine it self, that is, the principal Subject. Its an happy thing to have a sound Judgement in the matter maintained, and a gracious Spirit in the manner of maintaining it.

The Method I follow in this Book, is,

First, To treat of the Righteousness of God in general, wherein I do maintain against *Socinians*, That there is such an Attribute in God, whereby he is inclined to punish sinners, if there be not Satisfaction given.

Secondly, That Christ by his Sufferings in Soul and Body, as also by his Active Obedience, did truly, perfectly and really, not metaphorically satisfie this Justice of God, against *Socinians* also.

Thirdly, That the Righteousness of God, as well as his Mercy is demonstrated in our Justification, and that because God is thus Righteous, none can be accepted to Eternal Life, without perfect Righteousnesse.

Hereupon in the fourth place, We examine what this Righteousness is, first, Negatively, then Positively; Negatively, we shew, That its not any supposed Righteousness we can have by Nature, neither is it the Righteousness of the Law, no, nor the Personal Righteousness we have, consisting in Evangelical Graces, and good Works.

Neither lastly is our Faith, as it is a Work, accounted unto us for Righteousness: But Positively, it is an Imputed Righteousness, or a Righteousness without us: The matter whereof is Christs Righteousness, consisting

consisting partly in his Sufferings, and partly in his Obedience and Conformity to the Law of God. This is the brief Summe of that which is more largely maintained in the Book.

The Lord make this Tractate serviceable and usefull unto thee for thy Spirituall Edification in Christ.

August 14th
1654.

Anthony Burgesse.

THE CONTENTS OF THIS TREATISE.

SECT. I.

Of the Righteous Nature of GOD.

SERM. I.

Pſal. 11.7. *For the Righteous Lord, loveth Righteouſneſs.*

Demonſtrations of Gods Righteouſneſs; The Kindes of it, and in what ſenſe its attributed unto God.

SERM. II.

More Propoſitions concerning the Righteouſneſs of God; Shewing that we muſt judge of it onely by his Word; That its Eſſential and Natural to him; The Rule of all Righteouſneſs: That God cannot do any thing againſt his Righteous Will. How

a many

many wayes Righteousness is taken when attributed to God; And in what sense he is said to be Just in forgiving and rewarding his People.

Serm. III.

More Propositions about the Nature of Righteousness; Also shewing wherein Gods Love to the Righteous doth appear.

Serm. IV.

Answers some Objections against Gods Righteousness in himself, and his Love to Righteousness in men.

Serm. V.

A Modest Enquiry into Gods Providence about sinne. How farre he works about it, and yet no sinne to be imputed to him. And why God lets sinne to be.

SECT. II.

Of Christs Sufferings, Merit and Satisfaction.

Serm. VI.

Rom. 3. 26. *To declare (I say) at this time his Righteousness, that he might be Just, and the Justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.*

That all men through *Adams* Transgression are plunged into sinne, cursed by the Law, and obnoxious to the

the wrath of God, which is also upon them, and cannot be removed, unless there be a way of Satisfaction found out; That Christ voluntarily became man, and offered himself as a Sacrifice upon the Cross to satisfie Gods Justice, and expiate our Sinnes.

SERM. VII.

More Demonstrations of the Satisfaction of Christs Death to Divine Justice; With Answers to the *Socinian* Objections against it.

SERM. VIII.

More Propositions about the Sufferings of Christ for sinne: Their usefulness, sufficiency, and extent; With Answers to more Objections of the *Socinians*.

SERM. IX.

Our Justification by Christ a Demonstration not only of Gods Mercy, but Righteousness also. Or an instance of that Justice in God, whereby he will punish sinne. Also a Discussion of the proper Nature of Merit and Satisfaction, shewing that Christs sufferings had all the Requisites to *Satisfaction*.

SERM. X.

Of the Fulness, Perfection, and Infinite Worth of Christs Satisfaction, as further demonstrating Gods Righteousness in our Justification.

SERM. XI.

Why it was necessary our Redemption should be by way of Justice, with Distinctions of natural Necessity. And whether God could have remitted sin without Satisfaction, modestly discussed.

SECT. III.

Of the Justification of a sinner.

SERM. XII.

Rom. 8. 33. *It is God that Justifieth.*

Sheweth what Justification is, and what are the Adjuncts, Properties, and Effects of it.

SERM. XIII.

A particular Description of Justification.

SERM. XIV.

More Propositions tending to clear the Nature of Justification, especially shewing how it answers all *Accusations.*

SERM. XV.

The several Distinctions of Learned Men in the Point of Justification.

SERM. XVI.

An Examination of some Distinctions about Justification, much controverted by several Authors.

SECT. IV.

Setteth forth what is not that Righteousness, whereby a man is Justified.

SERM. XVII.

Rom. 10. 3. *For they being ignorant of Gods Righteousteousness, and going about to establish their own, have not submitted themselves unto the Righteousneß of God.*

Sheweth, That every man is *prone* to set up a Righteousness of his own, to be Justified by it, and whence it proceeds.

SERM. XVIII.

Another great Cause of Mens trusting in their own Righteousness, *viz.* A Practical ignorance or inconsideration of some necessary things relating to our Actions.

SERM. XIX.

Rom. 3. 10. *As it is written, There is none Righteous, no not one.*

The Necessity of a perfect Righteousness: And how destitute all men naturally are of it, with the grounds thereof.

SERM. XX.

Shewith, That every Man by Nature is spiritually Impure and Unclean, both in his *Person*, and in all his *Actions*, and therefore cannot be Justified by his own Righteousness. And treats of the salvation of Heathens.

SERM. XXI.

Gal. 3. 11. *But that no man is Justified by the Law in the sight of God, it is evident: For the Just shall live by Faith.*

That none can be Justified by the Works of the Law, though they are done by the Grace of God.

SERM. XXII.

That Justification cannot be attained by the Works of the Law.

SERM. XXIII.

1 Cor. 4. 4. *For I know nothing by my self, yet am I not hereby Justified.*

That the Works of a Godly man done graciously, are not the Condition, or *Causa sine qua non* of his Justification.

SERM.

SERM. XXIV.

More Arguments to prove the former Position.

SERM. XXV.

Rom. 4. 23, 24. *Now it is not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him.*
But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.

That Faith as it is a Work, or the τὸ credere, is not imputed unto us for our Righteousness.

SERM. XXVI.

More Arguments to prove, That Faith as it is a Work, is not imputed unto us for our Righteousness; With Answers to Objections. Also handling the Point of the Instrumentality of Faith.

SERM. XXVII.

Rom. 4. 25. *Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our Justification.*

That the whole Nature of Justification is not comprehended in Remission and Forgiveness of Sinnes.

SERM. XXVIII.

SECT.

SECT. V.

Of the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ both Passive and Active.

SERM. XXIX.

Rom. 4. 11. *And he received the sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith, which he had being yet uncircumcised---that Righteousness might be imputed to them also.*

That a Believers Righteousness is imputed. Divers Propositions about imputation of Good and Evil, and of Christs Righteousness in particular.

SERM. XXX.

The Doctrine of the Imputation of Righteousnesse demonstrated; With Answers to the Objections against it.

SERM. XXXI.

Isa. 53. 5. *But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.*

Of the Sufferings of Christ, both in Body and Soul, as imputed to us for our Righteousness.

SERM.

SERM. XXXII.

Sheweth, By Propositions and Arguments, That the whole Manhood of Christ suffered in Body and Soul, because of the Anger of God due to Sinners.

SERM. XXXIII.

Rom. 5. 19. *For as by one mans disobedience many were made sinners: So by the obedience of one shall many be made Righteous.*

Whether Christ while on Earth, did truly and properly *obey* the Will of God.

SERM. XXXIV.

Divers Propositions tending to clear the Point of the *Imputation of the Active Obedience of Christ.* And the Point truly stated.

SERM. XXXV.

Arguments to prove the Imputation of Christs Active Obedience to us for our Justification.

SERM. XXXVI.

More Reasons to prove the Imputation of Christs Active Obedience to Believers.

SERM. XXXVII.

The fore-going Argument prosecuted, and some more added.

SERM. XXXVIII.

Arguments against the Imputation of Christs Active Obedience, answered.

SERM. XXXIX.

That Christ was truly and properly subject to the Law of God, both General and Particular: And that he suffered in Obedience both to the Natural and Positive Law.

SERM. XL.

Some Objections Answered, and Distinctions Examined, concerning the Obedience of Christ.

SERM. XLI.

A further Dispute for the Imputation of Christs Active Obedience.

SERM. XLII.

In Answering the last Objection, is discussed, Whether and how farre Christ was bound to Obey and Suffer for himself: And shewed, that the same Arguments which are brought against the Active Obedience of Christ, make as much against his Passive.

SERM.

SERM. XLIII.

More Objections Answered, and the Doctrine cleared from Antinomianism.

SERM. XLIV.

More Objections Answered.

SERM. XLV.

More Objections Answered, with Antidotes against *Prejudice*.

The

The Names of the Authors cited in this Book.

A
Abbot Bish.
Amesius.
Andradius.
Anselm.
Aquinas.
Aristides.
Aristotle.
Austin.

B
Ab.
Barlaus.
Baronius.
Becanus.
Bellarmine.
Bertius.
Beza.
Bonaventure.
Bradwardin.
Bradshaw.
Brochem.
Buchol. Wegel.
Brockman.
Bucer.
Budeus.

C
Cajetan.
Calvin.
Castellius.
Catharinus.
Causabon.
Chemnitius.
Chrysostom.
Cocceius.
Covarruvias.
Clemens Alex.
Cloppenburgius.

D
Avenant.
De Dion.
Downam.
Durand.

E
Charo.
Erasmus.

F
Abricius.
Faustus.
Forbes.
Fraxinus.

G
Ataker.
Gibieuf.
Gomarus.
Gregory.
Grotius.
Grynæus.

H
Ierom.
Himelius.
Hooker.
Hugo.
Hyssichius.

J
Unius.

K
Argius.

L
Apide.
Leo.
Lindanus.
Lorinus.
Lubertus.
Lucius.
Lumper.
Luther.

M
Aldenas.
Martin.
Masso.
Meisner.
Mentzer.
Molina.
Musculus.

O
Lovian.

P
Areus.
Perkins.
Pererius.
Pezelius.
Photius.
Pighius.
Piltanus.
Pinchin.
Piscater.
Plutarch.
Polanus.

R
Ivet.

S
Andaus.
Sanderus.
Sasbont.
Scaliger.
Scotus.
Sixtus Senensis.
Socinus.
Stapleton.
Stephanus.
Suarez.
Suidas.

T
Arnovius.
Tapper.
Tertullian.
Trasymachus.
M. Tullius.
Twisse.

V
Asquez.
Vedellius.
Vives.
Vorstius.
Ursin.

W
Allans
Ward.
Wendelin.

Z
Anchy.

A TREATISE OF JUSTIFICATION.

PART II.

SECT. I.

Of the Righteous Nature of GOD.

SERM. I.

Demonstrations of Gods Righteousneſs; The Kindes of it, and in what ſenſe its attributed unto God.

PSAL. II. 7.

For the Righteous Lord, loveth Righteousneſs.

DAvid being now in exile, and like a Bird (as verſ. 1.) flying from mountain to mountain for his life, ſupporteth and comforts himſelf with arguments from Gods Righteouſneſs. He that had an Harp *to drive out the evil ſpirit from Saul*, findes faith in God to be of ſuch efficacy to chaſe away all unbelief and diſtruſt in his heart.

Therefore *vers.* 1. he professeth his confidence and dependance on God, which is aggravated from the malice of his enemies proceeding so farre, *That the very foundations are destroyed*; all help and power is gone; What then can a righteous man do? Yes, he telleth us what is to be done, *There is a righteous God in Heaven, whose eyes behold all things below, yea his eye-lids try the children of men*: A Metaphor from men, who when they look narrowly into a thing, shut their eyes a little; Thus Gods knowledge is inquisitive and exact; but this knowledge of Gods, is not a meer idle, speculative beholding, for thereby *God trieth the righteous*, viz. *by afflictions*; but as for the wicked, *his soul hateth them*; observe the emphasis, its more then simply to say, God hateth them. This hatred of God in respect of the wicked, is to be illustrated by an allusion to his judgements upon *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*; Every wicked man may fear that God should inflict the like, or equivalent punishments; for all this described in the Text, though terrible, yet is not as dreadful as hell; though one said of *Sodoms* judgements, that God did *pluere gehennam à Cœlo*, *fire and brimstone*, that is the extremity of pain; an *horrible tempest*, that is the violence; and *snares*, that denoteth the inevitability; lastly God will *rain* all these, that denoteth abundance even to overflowing. Neither let any wicked man think this is onely to some eminent notorious sinners, like those of *Sodom*, for the Psalmist concludes, *This is the portion of every wicked mans cup*. But for the godly he ends with an happy proposition, *The righteous Lord loveth righteousness*, and which is equivalent, *His countenance beholds the upright*. The Hebrew word signifieth a diligent, exact and constant beholding, as if God were so in love with such, as he never takes his eye off from them.

I am upon the former proposition, which indeed is two, one *implied*, the other *expressed*: *Implied*, The *Lord is a righteous Lord*. 2. This righteous Lord *loveth righteousness*. To open the words.

The Lord *Jehovah* is first described by this Title *Righteous*, *tzaddick*, from which say some the Greek word *Θεος* comes, as they say, *Θεος* of *θεσσειν*; but *ευσεβεια* derives that from

from *sin*, because justice consists in an equal dividing between two. The word *Righteous*, or *Gods Righteousness* is used several wayes, sometimes for the same with his *Goodness, Mercy and Benignity*, or at least his *Fidelity and Faithfulness* in his Promises. Thus *David* often praieth, *Psal.* 31. 1. *Psal.* 71. 2. So also *Psal.* 103. 17. that God would *deliver him in his righteousness, i. e.* his Mercy and Goodness: And *this Righteousness of God he professeth he will make mention of, and talk of to others.* Indeed some learned men, *Osiander, Cameron*, and all the *Socinians* upon a wicked interest they drive at (but the two former they do it innocently) affirm, That the Righteousness of God is never used for that, whereby he punisheth sinners; but for mercy and fidelity, say the *Socinians*, That whereby God avengeth himself on the wicked, is called *vengeance, fury, anger of severity*. But though it must needs be granted that righteousness is used so in many places, yet

1. It is more properly the *Syriack* use of the word, when it denoteth mercy, although the *Septuagint* do many times translate the Hebrew word for mercy *Chesed*, by *Dikaiosyn.* But

2. It cannot be denied but that in many places, it is used for *that propensity in God, whereby from his hatred to sinne, he punisheth wicked men*; and thus it must be here, as the Context evidenceth. Thus it is evidently used 2 *Chron.* 12. 6. *Rom.* 3. 5. Therefore in the next place, righteousness attributed to God, signifieth in the general, *That rectitude and purity in Gods Nature, whereby he is free from all sinne, and hateth all iniquity.* And then more particularly, that Attribute in God, *whereby he doth punish ungodly men*: And in this sense it is taken here, both for the generall and particular, as is more to be shewed. We observe then from hence,

Observe. *That God is a righteous God.* Psal. 145. 17. Hence 2 *Tim.* 4. 8. he is called *the Righteous Judge*. And *Abraham* expostulateth with God on this point, *Genes.* 18. 25. *Shall not the Judge of the whole world do right?*

This Doctrine is of great importance, and my purpose being

ing to treat of *that righteousnes whereby a believer stands justified before God*, its necessary to lay this as a foundation.

To understand this truth therefore consider these Propositions following,

I. Gods righteousnes twofold.

First, *Take notice, that the Scripture attributeth a two-fold Righteousnes to God, one we may call Universal, the other Particular.* Universal Righteousnes is that purity and integrity of his Nature considered absolutely in himself, whereby he is free from all sinne, and so its the same with *Justus Tam.*, &c. Even as *Aristotle* makes all virtue to be in Justice, because every virtue consists in a just and due temperament; and as the Apostle makes *ἁμαρτία* a general to all sinne; so that *Righteousnes* thus considered, is the same with *Purity, Holiness* and *Uprightness*, whereby whatsoever God doth, he doth it in a condecent and beseeming manner of a God. As *Anselm* said, *Quando parcit justum est ut parcat; quando punit justum est ut punias:* When God spareth he is just, and when he punisheth he is just; that is, in whatsoever God doth, he keeps up that rectitude and holiness, which a God is to do, he doth not shew himself as a creature in those things, but as a God. Now this universal righteousnesse is meant in this place as the foundation, for the Psalmist argueth God will punish the wicked, and defend the upright from his nature, because he is thus universally righteous. This universal Righteousnesse the Scripture describeth partly positively, by the infinite purity and holinesse that is in him. As the Apostle, *God is light, and in him there is no darknesse at all*, 1 Joh. 1.5. and partly by his opposition to sinne, *Hab.* 1. *Thou art of purer eyes, then to behold iniquity.* So *Psal.* 5. 4. *Thou art not a God that hast pleasure in iniquity.* Thus you see we are to apprehend of God, as an infinite, holy, pure and perfect God. Hence *Jam.* 1.13. the Apostle saith, *He can never tempt* others actively to sin, or be himself be passively *tempted* to sin.

Of Gods universal Righteousnes.

Of Gods particular Righteousnes.

In the next place there is his *particular righteousnes*, and that may be distributed according to all those relations he taketh upon him, he is the Lord having absolute dominion over all, and so he is a righteous Lord in using that Sove-

raignty;

reigney; He is a *Judge*, and therefore a righteous Judge, as the Apostle cals him; he is a *Father*, and our *Saviour*, John 17.25. cals him *righteous Father*; He is the Governour and Ruler of the world, and all this is administred in righteousnesse. Thus there is no relation, no office or state that God is pleased to assume, as a *King*, an *Husband*, but in all these the Lord works righteously.

Gods particular righteousnesse divided into several kindes.

Again, This particular righteousnesse of his may be divided into several kindes or *species*, not that there are such multiplied beings in God, for he is most simple and pure; but we thus distinguish according to our conceptions: As if a man should look in many glasses at the same time, it would be but one face, onely there would be multiplied reflections, and many faces in the several glasses. Thus Gods essence is one and the same, every thing in God, being God, but the diversity of objects, maketh a multiplied reflection to our understanding. The kinds of his particular Justice, are (as some make it)

1. His *Mercy*, they make even Gods grace and love a kinde of his Justice, because its so proper and just, that the chiefest good should be merciful. 1.

But in the second place, there is the righteousnesse of his *fidelity* and *promise*, whereby he keepeth his Word; for in his promises there cometh an obligation, if not of God to us, yet of God to himself: Thus they say he is *sibi debitor* in whatsoever he hath promised. 2.

3. *There is Righteousnesse vindicative*, whereby he punisheth wicked and ungodly men, as *Moses* describeth God by this righteous property, *That he will in no wise acquit the guilty*, Exod. 34.7. Therefore its but the devils case thou art put into, when thou dreamest only of mercy in God, not at the same time remembring his righteousnesse. 3.

II. Justice and righteousnesse properly attributed unto God.

Secondly, *Justice and Righteousnesse is truly and properly attributed unto God.* There are many things attributed unto God, and that by Scripture language, which yet must be understood improperly, or metaphorically. Thus the Scripture speaks of his *eyes* and *hands*: Thus it saith, *God repents* and is *grieved*, all which are to be understood figuratively, without

out any imperfection in God: Yea the words *Decree* and *Counsel*, if strictly taken, cannot be given to God, because in their rigorous sense they imply imperfection. Hence *Scaliger* said, *Tam impia vox est consilium in Deum, quam plurealitas Deitatis.* But righteousnesse is an absolute perfection, implying that which is excellent, and so in the highest degree to be affirmed of God.

When I say, Righteousnesse is thus an absolute perfection, I understand it of that general righteousnesse, whereby God is true and holy in his Nature, and in all his wayes: for as for political and civil righteousnesse, even *Aristotle* could say, it was absurd and ridiculous to attribute politicall virtues to God. Indeed there is a righteousnesse called commutative, which consists in an equality *inter datum & acceptum*, and this some Jesuites, as *Suarez Disput. de justitia Dei*, would have truly and properly in God. But *Vasquez* another Jesuite doth solidly oppose it, *Tom. 1. Prolegom. Disp. 85.* because it would bring down God from his glorious Soveraignty, and if there cannot be any strict Justice between a Father and a Sonne, a Master and a Servant, much lesse between God and the creature: Its true, all things we take from man and give to God, as to know, to understand and will, they have an imperfection, as they are in man, because they are accidents to man, and of a finite nature; yet we say (secluding the imperfection) they may in an eminent and transcendent consideration be given to God *analogically*, not *univocally*; for a thing may be said to have imperfection in it accidentally from the Subject, or essentially in its formal Nature, and what is of this later sort cannot properly be affirmed of God, as to grieve and repent. Now all such Justice as would make God a debtor to the creature, as if he did receive equally for what he hath given, supposeth an imperfection in the very nature thereof, as the Apostle argueth, *who hath first given to him?* Rom. 11. 35. *And what hast thou that thou hast not received?* Whether there be strict Justice between God the Father and Christ in the work of our Redemption, is not in this place to be discoursed on: Its certain, between God and a meer creature there cannot, and therefore all those

those Popish Doctrines of Merit and Satisfaction must fall to the ground. We see then in what sense Justice is attributed properly to God, and in what sense not.

III. Arguments demonstrating the Righteousness of God.

The third Proposition, *There are many Arguments that do strongly demonstrate God to be thus righteous.* As

1. 1. There is an inward principle in a mans conscience, whereby he is perswaded of Gods righteousnesse, for what is it that makes a man upon the omitting of grosse sins, such as the Law of Nature forbids, to have fear and remorse within, but the apprehension of a righteous God, who will call to a dreadful account? The very Heathens had that up often, Θεὸς ὁρᾷ καὶ δικαιοκρίνει, God hath a just and an avenging eye: Therefore *Rom.* 1, 32. its brought as an aggravation against those notorious sinners, *That though they knew the judgement of God, viz. That they which commit such things are worthy of death, yet not only do the same, but have pleasure in those that do them.* The Gentiles knew this judgement of God. Hence *Rom.* 2. 15. *Their consciences are said to accuse.* If then you ask, How can it be proved God is a righteous God? I answer, From thy own heart, thy own soul; in this respect it is *naturaliter Christiana*, as *Tertullian* said: Oh then, where will those wretched sinners appear, who live in all prophaneness and injustice, though a conscience within them crieth aloud that God is righteous! How canst thou stop thy ears to these loud cries? All thy mirth and jollity cannot raze this out, There is a righteous God.

2. 2. *The providential government of this world, so vast, and consisting of men so unruly and carried by their lusts, doth demonstrate a righteous God.* The world would be a *Babel*, would be an hell, had not God established an order of Superiours and Inferiours, of Governours and governed, as *David* acknowledged it was *the Lord subdued his people under him*, Psal. 18. 47. And when God *touched the peoples hearts, then they followed Saul*, 1 Sam. 10. 26. Thus *David* acknowledged Gods reigning in the world, that he *is the King of the earth, and that he judgeth righteously*, Psal. 67. 4. So that the harmony of a musical instrument doth not more palpably demonstrate the art of an Artificer, then the government of this

this world, doth the righteousnesse of the Governour, who is God; If a City, if a Nation cannot subsist without righteousnesse, *For, take away Righteousnesse* (saith *Augustine*) *and what are Kingdoms but great robberies? how much lesse can the World abide without a righteous preserver of it?* Righteousnesse is said *to go before God*, Psal.85.13. because that makes way for him in all his works.

3. 3. The Scriptures they are an undeniable and infallible principle to prove his righteousnesse. This is proclaimed in many places, *Psal.71.19. Psal.36.6. Psal.103.6.* Indeed when we look upon the divine dispensations of Gods works in the world, beholding the godly sometimes in an afflicted condition, and the wicked in a prosperous; we are apt to question the righteousnesse of God. Through these waters of afflictions, that which is strait seemeth crooked, as in *David* and *Jeremiah*. But then come we to the Word of God, there righteousnesse is affirmed in all his wayes, whatsoever our thoughts may be. The man that judgeth by the eye, thinketh the Sunne lesse then the world, but the Astronomer judging by principles of art, knoweth it is otherwise. Thus while we judge of Gods wayes according to humane principles, we call that unrighteous, which by Scripture light will appear most just.

4. 4. The righteousnesse that Angels and *Adam* was created in; yea that Image of God which is repaired in every godly man, consisting in *Righteousnesse and true Holinesse*, this doth necessarily inferre Gods righteousnesse, for as the Psalmist argueth, *He that made the eye, shall not he see? He that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?* Thus he that makes man righteous, shall not he much more be righteous? Is not this called the Image and likenesse of God? And why so? but because this is a representation of his Divine Essence. The creatures represent a God, but this Image doth a righteous God: If therefore thou seest any man working righteousnes, and loving righteousnesse in all his words and actions, know that righteousnesse is much more in the cause, in the fountain, which is God himself.

5. 5. The particular effects of Gods primitive Justice, or his

Judgements

judgements which he executeth in the world do also demonstrate his righteousnesse. God is not so in heaven, but his judgements, sometimes extraordinary, as in drowning of the world, burning the Cities of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*; and sometimes his ordinary ones, do teach every one, that God is not only merciful, but just, *Psal.*89.14. *Judgement and justice are the habitation of thy throne. Isa.*28.17. By the description these of judgement laid to the line, is excellently shewed the exactnes of justice God keeps to in destroying, he is as careful in destroying the mercies of a people, as an Artificer is to build an house.

6. Gods justice is evidently seen, in that the godly are not acquitted without satisfaction through Christ; even the righteousnesse of God makes way for all the glorious effects of his mercy, when that is satisfied then comes pardon of sins, and salvation: but of this more largely afterwards. 6.

Lastly, The appointing of judgement and everlasting torments to all impenitent sinners, will then convince all the world of his righteousnesse, *Act.* 24. 25. *Paul* preaching of this made *Felix tremble*, and 2 *Pet.* 2. 3, 4. *Jude v.* 15. speak terribly of this argument; Oh let not ungodly men take their ease and pleasure alwayes! Think of this righteous God, that hath appointed such a righteous day: as thy works have been so will God render to thee: Shall not unquenchable fire, eternal gnashing of teeth and everlasting howling in tormenting flames make thee afraid? *Nebuchadnezzar* made a Law, *That whosoever would not worship his Image should be thrown into a fiery fornace*, and this did so terrifie every one, that none refused but the three Worthies; yet this fornace was not like to hell, whose flames never go out. Take heed then of abusing mercy, for this will bring thee at last into the hands of justice: Oh then there will be righteousnesse without any mercy, not a drop of water to cool the top of the tongue! Oh wretched and seduced sinners! Will your moment pleasures recompence those eternal torments? Are thy sins as great a good to thee, as hell will be a losse and torment? 7.

Serm. II.

More Propositions concerning the Righteousness of God; Shewing that we must judge of it only by his Word; That its essential and natural to him; The Rule of all Righteousness: That God cannot do any thing against his Righteous Will. How many wayes Righteousness is taken when attributed to God; And in what sense he is said to be Just in forgiving and rewarding his People.

Psal. 11. 7.

For the Righteous Lord loveth Righteousness.

IV. We must judge of Gods Righteousness only by the Word of God.

We are to adde more Propositions that may clear this main Point about Gods Righteousness; And the fourth in order is, *That although there be many principles that demonstrate Gods Righteousness, yet we must judge of it only by the Word.* Though humane reason cannot but say, God is Righteous, yet we must not assert such a Righteousness in him

him as that would imagine, but what the Scripture directs us to: This is the Pillar to direct us in this wilderness: This is the Starre to guide. We must only learn of God, what we are to think of him, as by the light of the Sun we come to see the Sun. If the Heathen could say, that in respect of the celestial creatures and the knowledge of them, our understandings were but like the Owles eyes to the Sun, dazled more then inlightened: How much more is this true of God! What is the reason then that so many stumble at those Points in Divinity, about Gods permission and suffering of sin to be? about his discriminating of persons by Election and Reprobation? about the induration of sinners and punishing one sinne with another? about the imputation of *Adams* sinne to all his posterity? In these Points many have charged God with injustice only, because they judge of God by principles of humane justice. But it is well observed by *Musculus*, Its hard (saith he) to understand what a just God is, because its difficult to know what God is: Therefore when such opinions come to be discussed by thee, raise up thy minde to think of God, as a God; he is not a creature, he is not a sworn Judge tied by Laws, he is not under a Superiour to command and prescribe him, and therefore those things are justly done by God, because he hath an absolute Dominion and Soveraignty, which if a creature should do, it would be unjust. That is excellent of *Gregory* to this purpose, *Qui in factis Dei rationem non invenit, in infirmitate suâ invenit cur rationem non inveniat.* He that in Gods Works cannot finde a reason of them, may easily finde in his infirmities a reason why he cannot finde a reason. To suffer sinne to be when we can hinder it, this no creature may do; but God doth it justly. So to harden another man in sinne, no creature may do, if he could do it; but God as a just Judge doth it, not indeed by infusing wickedness, but by withdrawing or denying mollifying grace. So to cooperate to that action, to which the deformity of sinne doth necessarily adhere, a creature may not do it; but God being the supream Lord, and not tied by such laws as men are, he therefore may as a God do that, which a man cannot do without sinne; yet this is not to be

understood, as if God had an absolute power to do any thing against his Wisdom, and his Holy and Righteous Will, as is to be shewed; only this is brought to silence those prophane disputers of the world, as *Paul* did, *Rom.9.* who would bring God to account, and not submit to him, as having a supream Dominion over all. As many points in Religion, so the several passages of Gods Providence in this world, have made men doubt and dispute about his Righteousnes, That it should fare well with a wicked man, and he prosper in his sinnes, and on the contrary fare as ill with a godly man, so that he shall even *perish in his righteousnes*, Eccles.7.15. or at least as the same wise man observeth, *Eccles.9.2. All things fall alike to all, even to the righteous and the wicked*, &c. This consideration hath not only amazed the Heathens, but we see *David* and *Jeremiah* staggering under it; and indeed if we consule with humane principles, we undertake to measure the vast heavens with a little finger: but go we to Gods Word, there we see admirable arguments, declaring Gods Righteousnes in all these Providences, especially that we must suspend our judgements till the last day, when God will manifest to the world his Righteousnes: For as it is in the Scripture, if a man should make a full *period* in some verse, where there is but a *comma* or a *colon*, it would be blasphemy; As to take that verse of the Psalmist, *Thou art not a God that hast pleasure in iniquity*; if a man should make a full stop, reading *Thou art not a God.* this would be blasphemy; but if he reade to the period, its excellent sense: So whosoever judgeth of Gods Righteousnes by his Providential passages, before God hath made a full end, he may charge God foolishly. Learn we then from the Scripture, to judge with fear and reverence about Gods Righteousnes, believing him to be Just and Righteous in all his Works, even when we cannot demonstrate it.

V. Gods Justice and Righteousnes is Essential and Natural to him.

The fifth Proposition, *Gods Justice and Righteousnes is essential and natural to him*, and so is the same with God. Howsoever *Vorstius* blasphemously asserted Accidents in God, denying what is in God to be God. That being, God is a most simple uncompounded being, it must needs be so. God is,

as

as *Turrett. de Trin.* saith, not ὅλον σύνθετον, but ὅλως ἁπλοῦν, he is not an integral whole consisting of parts, but *totaliter totum, a most perfect uncompounded whole.* Otherwise if we admit composition, we must also grant imperfection in him. Justice then being a property in God, its the same with his Nature: and if you say, How can God be just and merciful too, if both be his infinite Essence? I answer, Very well, for these two Properties as essential in God, are not opposite to one another; indeed the effects of justice and mercy are sometimes contrary, but the Attributes themselves are not, of which more afterwards, as also how farre the effects of his Justice are natural, and yet free to him.

VI. Gods Nature and Will the Rule of all Righteousness.

The sixth Proposition, *God is so Righteous, that his Nature and his Will is the rule and measure of all righteousness.* Even as in artificial things, therefore this or that work is done right or artificially, because conformable to the Idea of the Artificer which he hath in his minde: Or as *Aquinas* saith, Gods knowledge (*viz.* practical) is the cause of all created truth, and the rule of it, so also Gods holy Will is the rule and measure of all created good and righteousness; a thing being therefore just, because consonant to that eternal rule of Righteousness. Indeed there are somethings that are just and righteous in their nature intrinsecally, as to love God, to do righteously with man, and these are not just because God Wils them, but they are just, and therefore he Wils them; yea such is his Perfection that he cannot but Will them, neither can he dispense to the contrary: Though even these things are therefore just, because conformable to Gods nature, or that eternal Law of Righteousness within him; for seeing they are not the first, and uncreated righteousness, but created, they must needs have a rule to measure them by. 2. There are righteous things, not from their nature, but meerly from a command, and so are righteous because commanded, as in the forbearing to eat of the forbidden fruit; so all the Levitical worship, these had no intrinsecal holiness, but therefore they were good, because required. Lastly, *Bradwardin* addeth a third kinde, which he cals *Justa mixta*, mixed or compounded of both the other: For although it was not intrin-

intrinsecally evil for *Adam* to eat of the forbidden fruit, setting aside the command, yet supposing the command, then it was intrinsecally evil for a creature not to obey the command of his Creator. Now as this is a mixed righteous good thing, so Gods Will about it is mixed, the one part being willed because righteous, the other righteous because willed. And this very consideration must needs convince that God cannot Will any thing unrighteously, for how can the Rule of Righteousness be unrighteous? we may better say, there cannot be any sinne, then that God can Will it, for if he should Will it, it would not be a sinne; as if the arrow were the mark, it could never miss. Oh what obedientiall resignation should this teach us, resign thy self unto Gods Will, as that which is most Righteous, and wherein there cannot be the least inordinacy.

VII. God cannot do a thing against his Just and Righteous Will.

The seventh Proposition, *We may not apprehend in God any such absolute power, whereby he may do a thing against his just and righteous Will.* There is by the Schoolmen large Disputes about Gods absolute power, whether he may not forgive sin to a sinner, though he remain impenitent; and with the *Socinians*, Whether God may not absolutely pardon sinne freely without any satisfaction; but howsoever men may speak boldly here, intruding to things above mans reach, yet this must be concluded on, that it is a great dishonour to apprehend a power in God to do any thing against the rules of his Wisdom and Justice: (As when some Schools determine, that God may command the hatred of himself, yea that by such an hatred of God a man may *mereri*, merit;) for that were to conceive him a God that had power to sinne, and so to be no God: Therefore some have wholly rejected that distinction of *Potestas absoluta* and *ordinata* in God, for if it be so (saith *Bonaventure*) then there would be a *potestas* in God *inordinatè agere*, to act and work inordinately: but it cannot be denied, that God hath a power to do many things, which yet he will not do; as Christ said, his Father could send him legions of Angels, and so he was able to raise up children to *Abraham*, even out of stones; but if God should do these things, then he would do them justly also, and righteously;

so

so that do them or do them not, in each God is Righteous. And thus *Scotus* well explained that distinction, That there is no *potentia absoluta* in God, contradistinguished to *ordinata*, for if God should work otherwaies then he did, that *potentia* would be *ordinata*. Let us not therefore give liberty to endless disputes about an absolute power in God, which we cannot comprehend, but satisfie our selves with that Wise and ordered Power of his that is manifested in the Word. We may say of God and his Attributes, as *Austin* said of the Trinity, *Dicimus tres Personas, non ut diceretur, sed ne taceretur.* And that is a truth, *Deus verius cognoscitur quam dicitur, & verius est quam cognoscitur.*

VIII. Righteousness when attributed to God is taken three waies.

The eighth Proposition, *This doth much tend to the clearing of the true doctrine about Gods Righteousness*: Righteousness when attributed to God is taken three waies: Sometimes for an attribute in God, the same with his Nature: Thus in the text and *Ps.* 145.17. Sometimes it is taken for the actual administration of Righteousness, for the execution of his just judgements, 2 *Chron.* 12.6. *Ezra* 9.15. Lastly, for the judgements themselves, *Jer.* 33.15. *Isa.* 16.5. Even as the mercy of God is sometimes taken either for the Attribute of God, or for his actual compassion, or for the effects of his mercy, and so Gods will is either taken for the τὸ βουλητικὸν, the power to will, or τὴν βούλησιν, the act of willing, or τὸ βουλητὸν, the object willed. Now when we speak of Gods Righteousness, its of great consequence to know whether we mean his Attribute of Righteousness, or the effects, for these two exceedingly differ, as in these considerations.

1. Its a lawfull and ordinary prayer which the Church often useth, whereby she deprecateth the Justice of God, and fleeth to his Mercy: They supplicate, that God would not deal with them according to his Justice, but according to his Mercy; Now if in this prayer, by Justice should be meant Gods Attribute, there would be some blasphemy in the prayer, for God cannot but be Just, and deal justly: we may as well pray, that God would not be God. But if by Justice we understand the effects of Justice, then the prayer is very good and sound, *viz.* that God would not, through Just in-

his

his Nature, yet bring such effects of his wrath upon us, that may overwhelme us. We pray not then against the Attribute of God, but against the effects of it, which are subject to the liberty of his Will, whenas his Attributes are not.

2. The effects of Gods justice are various and different, there are more upon some then upon another, but his Attribute cannot be so. When God executed some extraordinary punishments upon some notorious sinners, as the old world, the *Sodomites*, there we may say, God wrought more effects of his Justice upon those sinners then others, yet we cannot say, God is more just in punishing of them, then in other wicked men. Even as it is in Gods mercy, take it for an Attribute, we cannot say, God is more or less mercifull; but if for the effects of it, then he is so in his Justice, God is alwaies alike just, he is not more just at one time, then at another; but the effects of his Justice may be more at one time, and in one place then another.

3. Hence it followeth that Righteousnes taken for the effects of it, are not the same with God, neither is there a natural necessity of them; but if taken for an Attribute, its the same with God, and so God had been a just God, though there had been no creatures made, no sinne to be punished. As he is a Wise God, and a merciful God, and a Mighty God, though he had not demonstrated any effects thereof. God is necessarily Righteous, but he doth not necessarily work such and such effects of his Righteousnes.

4. If Gods Righteousnes be taken, as often it is in Scripture, for the effects of his righteousnes, then there is a contrariety between them, and the effects of his mercy. To be preserved alive by Mercy, and to be destroyed by Justice are contrary, and so cannot be together upon the same subject. Now, though the effects be thus contrary, yet the Attributes from whence they flow are not contrary, for God is both at the same time, infinitely Righteous, and infinitely Merciful, there is no contrariety between them, but the effects of these may be in such an high degree, that they can never be together; as a man cannot be saved and damned at the same time, for these are the effects of Mercy and Justice in an high degree.

Indeed

Indeed if we consider some effects of these Attributes in a more remiss degree, then they may be together, and in many things God doth shew forth both his Mercy and Justice together, yea even in hell God (they say) doth some work of mercy, because he doth punish *citra condignum*, he breaketh not out to the utmost of punishment sinne doth deserve.

Lastly, If we take Gods Righteousnes *ad intra*, as an Attribute in him, we cannot say that God hath less of that, then of Mercy, if that also be taken as an Attribute; God is as just as he is mercifull, and as mercifull as he is just. Therefore when it is said, *James* 2.13. *Mercy rejoyceth against judgement*, and when God is described mercifull, ready to forgive, but slow to wrath, these places are to be understood of the effects of these Attributes, not the Attributes themselves, for so God is no more inclining to Mercy then to Justice, they being both Infinite Perfections in him: But if we speak of the effects, then in this life, God is more ready to shew forth the effects of his love and long suffering, as at the day of judgement he will more demonstrate the effects of his Justice. This is the time of mercy, then the time of Justice. Lastly, It cannot be denied but that the Scripture speaking of Gods rewarding holy men with eternal life, doth attribute it to Gods justice, as 1 *John* 1.9. *He is faithfull and just to forgive us our sinnes.* Heb. 6.10. *God is not unrighteous to forget your labour of love.* 2 *Thess.* 1.6. where its made *a righteous thing with God to punish the persecutors of the Church*, but to give *rest to them that are troubled.*

This being clear, we are to examine whether Justice be here taken strictly or meerly improperly, so as to signifie no more then the truth and fidelity of his promise, insomuch that if he should not bestow heaven upon the godly, he would be only unjust in his Word; not that he owed a godly man heaven, and had received of him equivalent for it. Some Papists, especially *Suarez* (as you heard) contends for this earnestly, That there is a true proper commutative justice between God and the godly man, when he is made happy. But this is too proud and high: 1. From the transcendency of the reward to our godly actions. In all strict justice there must be an

equality between the thing given and received, but now heaven is so far above all our duties, that if all the glory of the world should be given to a man for lifting up a straw, it would not be comparable. *Genes. 32. I am less then the least of thy mercies*, saith *Jacob*, then much more less then the greatest; if a man be less then a drop of water, much less then heaven it self: so *Rom. 8. These present sufferings are not worthy to that eternal weight of glory.* 2. Our condition is such, that there cannot be any strict justice between God and us, because whatsoever we have it is his gift, *Rom. 11. Who hath first given to him?* So that although God vouchsafe grace to us, yea and makes a promise to this grace, yet he doth not lose his dominion over us. We are his servants still, and therefore the more we have, the more we are bound to be thankfull to him, and not to stand on terms of justice. Therefore we see the Scripture attributing both Election, Vocation, Justification and Salvation, all these from the first to the last, solely to his grace and good pleasure. And hence it is that eternal life is called the gift of God, and an inheritance, which exclude any such thoughts as may crave it by way of justice.

Use of Instruction. How unwise they are for their salvation, who look upon God as mercifull only, not at all attending to his justice, whereas you have heard God is equally Righteous, and that he is no more mercifull then just! Hence you have threatnings as well as promises: Why then doth not this wound thy heart more? Is there not an hell as well as an heaven? Is there not damnation as well as salvation? Why then dost thou hope alwaies for one, and never feareſt the other? Now indeed mercy compasseth you about, by mercy you eat, drink and sleep, but at the day of judgement Justice will inviron you, then Justice prepares eternal torments, then Justice crieth aloud, *Depart ye cursed*; above, below, within, without, thou seest nothing but the effects of a just and righteous God.

SERM.

Serm. III.

More Propositions about the Nature of Righteousness; Also shewing wherein Gods Love to the Righteous doth appear.

Psal. 11. 7.

For the righteous Lord loveth Righteousness.

WE proceed to the second Proposition, which is expressed and declared, *viz. That the righteous Lord loveth Righteousness*; such as his Nature is, such he is, and such he loveth: A righteous God loveth righteous men. The Hebrew word for *Love* signifieth vehemently and greatly to love, and therefore seldom rendred by the Septuagint ἀγαπᾶν, but φιλεῖν, which is greatly rest in our love, and to be satisfied therewith as Christ is called ἀγαπητὸς & υἱός.

The love of God is two-fold:

1. General and common, which is carried out to a creature as his creature.

2. More peculiar and special, whereby he doth will to the persons loved everlasting happinesse and salvation; Of this love it is that the Psalmist speaketh; As for the Object of this love it's said to be righteousnesse. It's usual with the Hebrews for emphasis sake to put the *Abstract* for the *Concrete*, *righteousnesse* for a *righteous person*, as here. But then secondly, there is a further emphasis, the plural number for the singular,

gular, its *righteousnesses* in the Hebrew, to shew that he only is righteous, who hath all the parts and kindes of righteousnesse. Thus you have the word in the plural, *Isa.* 33. 15. As at another time it doth ingeminate the word, to signifie the emphasis also and fulnesse of righteousnesse, *Deut.* 16. 20. *Thou shalt do justice, justice*, that is, as the Translators render it, that which is altogether just.

Observ. *That God being righteous in his Nature doth only love righteousnesse in the creature.* The righteous God loveth a righteous man. To manifest the truth of this, consider

I. First, That as we mentioned about Gods righteousnesse, so also about mans, *There is a two-fold consideration of it:* First, *General*, as it signifieth the rectitude and conformity of the whole man to Gods Law; and in this sense its most frequently used in the Scripture, and so is the same with a holy, pure and upright man. This righteousnesse *Adam* was created in, and is called the image of God; for although there was among the *Romans* righteous men, as *Fabricius* of whom they said, they might sooner turn the Sunne out of its course, then move him from what is righteous; and among the *Grecians* there was *Aristides* the just, so called by all for his righteousnesse, yet these did not arrive to the righteous men the Scripture speaks of, who are sanctified in their Natures, and have the Image of God by his gracious power repaired in them.

2. There are the parts and kindes of righteousnesse in a more particular manner, as it consists in dealing between man and man: This is distinguished from godlinesse, *Titus* 2. 12. and thus among the moral Philosophers, justice is made a special distinct moral virtue, from other virtues: By this a man hath a constant will and purpose to give to every one that is due to him; without this Societies cannot consist, and whosoever is righteous the former way, is also in this later way, he is righteous in his words, just and faithful in all his actions, as 1 *John* 5. *He that is born of God doth righteousnesse.*

II. Secondly, *The proper Nature of Righteousnesse lieth in a conformity to the Law of God*, which is the rule of righteousnesse,

neſſe, even as the proper formal nature of ſinne, lieth in the tranſgreſſion of the Law. Indeed Gods righteous nature and his will, is the original and archetypal rule, but the will of God revealed is the ectypal or copy of that original, ſo that if we would judge whether an action be righteous, or a perſon righteous, we muſt gather it by his conformity to the Law of God. Indeed there go many things to righteouſneſſe, Many things go to Righteouſneſs.

1. An integrity or univerſality of the parts of it, called therefore the Image of God; ſo that as a mans body is not an hand or foot, but the comprehenſion of all; This neither is righteouſneſſe in one action, or in one kinde, or at one time, but there muſt be an univerſality of theſe. 1.

2. As univerſality, ſo there muſt be a *debitum*, a due or an obligation for the Subject to have it, as in the underſtanding a meer neſciency is not a ſinne, but an ignorance of that we ought to know; ſo in the will a meer *non volition*, or omiſſion is not a ſin, unleſſe it be of that which is due either to God or man. 2.

3. There muſt be purity of intention, a love of righteouſneſſe for righteouſneſſe ſake. As *Anſelm* defined *Juſtitia* to be *Rectitudo voluntatis propter ipſam ſervata*: whatſoever is not done for righteouſneſſe ſake, and out of care to it, but for applauſe, profit, or other carnal ends, that is not true righteouſneſſe. 3.

Laſtly, Which is the formal nature of righteouſneſſe, there muſt be a commenſuration or adequation to the rule of righteouſneſſe; ſo that δίκαιον and νόμιμον are all one, that which is righteous, and that which is eſtabliſhed by a Law. Now the righteouſneſſe of the Phariſees, though ſo highly eſteemed amongſt men, yet was rejected by God. As a rotten poſt ſhineth in a dark night, but when the Sun ariſeth, then all know what it is. Thus when Chriſt by the light of his Miſtry diſcovered what true righteouſneſſe was, that of the Phariſees was manifeſted to be light and empty, for their righteouſneſſe failed in univerſality, becauſe they omitted many things, and ſuch as were chiefeſt failed in the debt and obligation of it: Chriſt asked, *Who had required thoſe things at their hands*: it failed in the purity of intention, *for they did* 4.

all things to be seen of men. Lastly, it failed inconformity to a Law, for being no commandment was for many things they did in which they placed righteousnesse, there could not be any conformity to a Law: for without a Law as there is no transgression, so no righteousnesse.

III. Thirdly, *There are persons who are truly and really righteous.* This is to be noted, because the Papists generally calumniate the Protestants, as if they held there were no righteous persons, with an inherent righteousnesse. Among Protestants (say they) a man hath no righteousnesse, but an extrinsecal and imputed one; so that though a man be full of iniquity, yet he is a righteous man, because Christs righteousnesse is made to him, but this is a notorious reproach; for although we say indeed, that the holiest men which live, have not a holinesse inherent in them, whereby they stand justified before God, yet they have a true personal, inward, habitual righteousnesse, as also an outward actual one, which doth in truth, though not in perfection agree with the rule; and this is clear, for the Scripture giveth both the *title*, and the *new*, the title and nature of righteousnesse to them. The title thus, *Abel* and *Noah*, *Zachary* and *Elizabeth*, are said to be *righteous persons*, and it gives the nature of it to them, in that it saith, *They walked in all the Commandments of the Lord unblameably*, as also *in that they are renewed according to the image of God*, which consists in *righteousnesse and true holinesse*, for although this righteousnesse they have be not perfect, yet its true: So that hereby even God himself distinguisheth them from sinners and ungodly persons, and although sinne cleaveth to them, yet they are denominated righteous from the more noble and excellent quality in them, as we say a man is rational, though his body be void of reason. There are then persons sanctified by the grace of God, who are truly and indeed righteous.

IV. But yet fourthly, *God loveth none to justification and special favour with him, unlesse he have a perfect compleat righteousnesse answering the rule, which because the most righteous men on earth have not, therefore they need a righteousnesse without them to be made theirs.* Hence *Paul* Phil. 3. would not be found in his own righteousnesse,

righteousnesse, but that which is by faith in Christ. And *David* also prayeth *God would not enter into judgement with him, for that no flesh would be justified,* Psal. 143. 2. We must not then trust or depend upon this inherent righteousnesse of ours, but flie to an imputed righteousnesse. As *Luther* expressed it, We must go from an active righteousnesse to a passive, from that we do to that we receive, for God requireth a perfect righteousnesse which we have not: But of this more in its proper place. Come we to shew wherein Gods love to righteousnes doth appear.

Wherein Gods love to Righteousnes doth appear.

1. And first, *There cannot be a better testimony of it, then the Law of God, or his Commandments, which in all particulars requireth exact and perfect righteousnesse.* The holinesse of Gods Word doth demonstrate the Divinity of it; All the moral Philosophers have not attained to the shadow of that righteousnesse, which the Word commands; this requireth inward and outward righteousnesse; this commands a righteous heart, and righteous thoughts, and righteous affections, a pure spring as well as pure streams. Hence it is when a man comes to be sanctified, that with *Paul, He delights in the Law of God,* Rom. 7. and with *David accounts it above all riches and sweetnesse,* Psal. 19. because its such a spiritual and holy Law: but wicked and unsanctified men they cannot endure it.

2. Secondly, *Gods love to righteousnesse appeareth in all his hatred and wrath against sinne.* Its that onely which God hateth and will punish to all eternity; God hateth not any, because afflicted, poor or miserable; yea he pitieth such, but if thou art wicked, then his soul is set against thee: Look in the Scripture, and whensoever you reade of Gods hatred, anger, vengeance and fury, its always because men have sinned against him, *Psal* 45. 7. *Thou lovest righteousnesse and hatest iniquity.* These two are necessarily joyned together: Even as we are commanded *Rom.* 12. *to hate that which is evil.* The word signifieth, *to hate it, as we do hell it self,* to be as unwilling to sinne as to be damned, and then *cleave to that which is good.* The word signifieth *to be glued to it with intimate and adhering affections*; if we then would know how

greatly

greatly God loves righteousnesse, it will appear by his wrath and punishments of unrighteousnesse, *Psal.*7.11. *God is angry with the wicked all the day long.* There is not an hour, a moment wherein God is not provoked against a wicked man, especially Gods hatred against sinne, is seen in ordaining everlasting, easlesse torments, and that for the least sinne, so that the least vain thought, or idle word, if not repented of, God hath appointed eternal torments, as their reward, though thou hast committed no other sinne. Therefore its not onely against hainous and notorious sinnes, but even the least that God hath prepared those eternal flames of hell. Hence we see his fury against the Angels, throwing them into everlasting chains of darknesse, and meerly because of sinfull thoughts, and corrupt motions of the will, for they being spiritual substances, were not capable of other sins; Oh then, let every one tremble at the commission of the least sin, seeing God hath declared such anger against it.

3. Thirdly, *Gods love to righteous persons appeareth in all his mercifull and gracious Works he vouchsafeth to them.* They onely are the object of his Love and Delight, to such only he doth communicate himself. As

1. By the Scripture we see his constant approbation and complacency is in such, *Psal.*1.6. *The Lord knoweth the way of the righteous*; he knoweth it by approbation, by love and special blessings vouchsafed to it. So that all the way of a righteous man, not onely some actions, but his whole conversation is pleasing to him, we may say the contrary to what is spoken of the wicked; God is pleased with the righteous all the day long. That is a remarkable expression, *Psal.*34.15. which for the excellency of it is alledged 1 *Pet.* 3.12. *The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and his ears open to their cries.* The eyes of the Lord are upon them, not towards them, to shew the great delight and care of God, he never takes his eye off them, yea both eyes and ears are for them. This (to speak after men) implieth that God is (as it were) taken up wholly with them, as if there were no other work to be done in the world

world by God, but his attendance and care over the righteous: Oh then, how happy are such that walk in all Righteousnesse! The eyes of God are alwayes upon them for good.

2. As his great love is thus towards them, so his preservation and protection of them is admirable in all calamities and miseries. Thus *Noah*, because a *righteous person*, and a *Preacher of Righteousnesse*, hath an *Ark* to preserve him, when the whole world is drowned; and so *Lot*, 2 Pet. 2. 8. a righteous man, and whose *righteous soul was vexed*, tormented, as if he had been in hell (the word may so signifie.) The Scripture saith concerning him, *That the Lord knoweth how to deliver such*, Prov. 11. 8. *The righteous is delivered out of trouble, and the wicked cometh in his room*: Yea, *Prov.* 21. 18. *The wicked is said to be a ransom for the righteous*, that is, God will give up many wicked men to destruction to preserve a righteous man. Are not then those promises of Scripture truths powerful demonstrations of Gods love to righteous persons?

3. *Gods love to the righteous doth further appear, in that for their sakes he keeps off judgements from the wicked of the world.* As *Gen.* 18. we have a full proof of it, when God condescended so farre, as to say, *For ten righteous mens sake, he would not have destroyed Sodome and Gomorrah*; So that righteous men are the pillars and a foundation of the Land. Therefore the Prophet complains, *Isa.* 57. 1. *The righteous man perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart*: Why should they lay to heart the death of a righteous man? Because for his sake God continueth many mercies, and withall his death is a sad Prognostick of imminent calamities: Therefore its added *The righteous is gathered*; A Metaphor either from those who gather up their Jewels and Plate together, when a fire is rising upon an house, or else from the Shepherd that gathereth his Flocks together into some place of defence, when he seeth a violent storme coming.

4. *God loveth the righteous, in that his goodnesse is not onely vouchsafed to them, but to their posterity also.* So acceptable

table is righteousnesse to God, that where he findes it, not only the persons themselves, but their seed after them shall be blessed, *Prov.* 11.22. *The seed of the righteous are delivered.* When righteous parents are dead and forgotten by all their neighbours, yet God remembreth such; and though their seed be exposed to the world, and all do forget their parents, yet God will not: especially that famous place is never to be forgotten, *Psal.* 37.25. where *David* professeth, That in all the experience he had from his younger years to his old age, *He never saw the righteous forsaken, or his seed begging bread.* This place hath much exercised the thoughts of Interpreters, for we reade *David* himself asking for bread of *Abimelech* the Priest; and *Lazarus*, whose soul was received into heaven, lay at the rich mans gate, begging even for very crums of bread. To this many reply several answers, Some place it upon *David*'s experience, he doth not say, that in no age the righteous or his seed may not beg bread, but he in all his time had not observed it. Others place it in the nature of *beggery*, that is, say they, a punishment and a curse by the Law of God; and therefore though the righteous may be so poor, and their seed also as to need sustenance from others, yet the curse of this poverty, which is called beggary, is taken from them. Thus some reconcile that seeming contradiction, *Deut.* 15.4. where God promiseth so to blesse them, *that there shall be no poor amongst them*; yet at *verse* 7. he saith, *If there be any poor amongst you, thou shalt relieve him when seven years come, &c.* By the former poor is meant a Beggar, one that is cursed by Gods Law; By the second, any needy person that wants relief from others.

Others they answer this difficulty from the word [*forsaken*] They never saw the righteous forsaken, nor his seed, though begging bread, not forsaken, because if God doth not always provide necessaries for them, yet he doth support them inwardly, and blesse them with a contented spirit, as the Martyr said, *If they took away his food from him, God would take away his stomack from him.*

Others, They answer it from the exposition of the word *righteous*,

righteous, which (say they) doth not signifie a strict, just, righteous man, but a liberal beneficent man; for by liberal things a liberal man is said to stand, *Isa.* 32. 8. and many promises of earthly comforts are made to such as are compassionate to those that are in necessities.

Some answer it from the Hebrew word *seeking* or *begging*, which signifieth such an anxious, careful seeking as Heathens do, without any faith in God, and any hope to speed.

Others distinguish between an *occasional begging*, and a *constant, perpetual way*. *David* begg'd bread of *Abimelech* and *Nabal*; so *Elisha* of the widow of *Sarepta*, but this was occasional not perpetual.

But lastly, That which is most satisfactory is, that such places which either promise or declare the outward prosperity of the righteous, are to be understood by light from other places of Scripture, and that is, They shall never fall into such outward calamities, unless when God seeth it good for them, for sometimes chastisements and afflictions are better then mercies, as *Austin* said, There was *crudelis quædam misericordia*, and *misericors quædam sævitia*. This is certain, when wealth and outward comforts are good for them and their soul, they shall always have them, and if they were as necessary to them as Christ is, God would no more deny that to them, then he doth Christ. But you must know these promises of earthly mercies are more frequent in the Old Testament, as being more suitable to that dispensation.

5. *God loveth righteousnesse, because it is and by that God doth comfort and support the hearts of those that are so.* It is observable what is said, *Isa.* 58. 8. of a righteous man, *His righteousnesse shall go before him*, i.e. that shall make way for his acceptance with God and man. There shall not be any Law or barre to him from coming into Gods presence. He shall not with *Esther* say, *I have not been called into the Kings presence*, and so make it hazardous to go in unto him. Their righteousnesse, as you see in *Job*, was the testimony or evidence they had against all fears and doubts. Hence *Prov.* 3. 32. *His secret is said to be with the righteous*; and *Ephes.* 6. 14. it is called *the brest-plate of righteousnesse*. This is a good Nurse in our old

age. This is like young *Abishag* in old *Davids* bosome: as *Hezekiah, Remember, O Lord, that I have walked before thee in truth and uprightnesse of heart.*

Lastly, *God will crown righteous men with everlasting glory.* If *Mal.* 3. *ult.* God saith in the end of his dispensations even in this world, they shall discern between the righteous and the unrighteous, how much more will this be true at the day of Judgement, when the *goats shall be placed at the left hand, and commanded to depart into everlasting fire, but the sheep and the righteous shall be called to inherit that glory which was of old prepared for them?*

Use of Instruction. Doth the Lord love righteousnesse, then do thou exercise thy self in the way of righteousnesse all the day long, both universal and particular righteousnesse? Conform thy whole man to Gods rule, live not according to thy lusts, to the principles of the world, but according to Gods will; Be righteous in thy words, in thy actions, in all thy dealings. Beware no such wicked thought arise in thy heart, as to think, If I deal righteously, if I do not lie, cheat, defraud, I shall not enrich my self, I shall lose such and such advantages. Its a Proverb raised from hell, *He that useth honesty or righteousnesse shall die a beggar.* I grant that in this wicked world, a mans righteousnesse may hinder him of many advantages, which unjust men will greedily imbrace, and therefore *Thrasymachus* the Heathen called Righteousnesse πάνυ γενναίαν εὐηθειαν, a general and noble folly. But stay till the end of all, till the day of Judgement, then you will see the difference God will make between the righteous and unjust, then the unjust will vomit up all this sweet morsel, and will become a beggar indeed, crying for a drop of water, and cannot have it.

SERM. IV.

Answers some Objections against Gods Righteousness in himself, and his love to Righteousness in men.

PSAL. 11. 7.

For the Righteous Lord loveth Righteousness.

I Shall conclude the subject mentioned in the Text, *viz.* Gods Righteousness in himself, and his love to it in man, when some few eminent Objections are Answered. The work remaining to be done, is to clear some Objections which are made against Gods Righteousness; for even Owles have adventured to look into this dazeling Sun, and Dwarfs would measure these Pyramides.

And the first Objection usually raised is this, *How can God be said to love Righteousness, to approve and command that only, seeing that in the Scripture we see him commanding those things that seem to be very unjust and against nature?* The famous instances are, 1. *Gods command to* Abraham, *that he should offer up his only son* Isaac, *Gen.* 22.2. *Was not this to will* Abraham *should do that which was most unnatural?* 2. They instance in the Israelites, *Exod.* 11.2. *Exod.* 3.22. *Exod.* 12.35. Where *God commands* Moses *to speak to the Israelites, that they borrow Jewels and Vessels of Gold of the Egyptians, as if they intended to restore them again, whereas thereby they robbed and spoiled the Egyptians. Is not this for God to allow and command theefs and lying?* The third instance is from *Hosea* 1.2. Where the Pro- *Obj.*

phet is commanded to *take a wife of whoredoms, i.e.* an eminent and notorious whore, *and to beget children of whoredoms.* And *verſ.* 3. *the Prophet did thus. Now this ſeemeth to be a very wicked and ſcandalous thing that the Prophet is commanded to do; and therefore by theſe inſtances, How can we ſay God doth ſo love Righteouſneſs that he hateth all iniquity?*

But theſe texts may eaſily be cleared.

Anſw. For the firſt, Gods command to *Abraham* to kill his ſon, was not abſolute and peremptory, it was only a command of trial, to diſcover his faith and obedience; for though *Abraham* received it as an abſolute command, yet the event diſcovered it was only conditional, and for trial. But ſecondly, Grant that God had peremptorily required this, ſo as that *Abraham* had obeyed it, yet herein God had willed no unjuſt or unrighteous thing, becauſe God hath an abſolute, ſupream, and unlimited dominion over all mens lives, ſo that although one man is bound not to kill another, yet God may take away any mans life, when and how he pleaſeth: God may annihilate all men, ſeeing he only created them, and gives them all the being they have. So that if God might have deſtroyed or killed *Iſaac* immediatly by his own hand, he might alſo command *Abraham* to be an inſtrument thereunto. Hence alſo it is, that God might without injuſtice or wrong have commanded men to have been ſacrificed to him as beaſts were, as we ſee the Heathens did their, thereby acknowledging Gods ſupream dominion: but he being full of mercy and compaſſion appointed the ſacrifice of beaſts in mans ſtead, which was witneſſed by the ſacrificers laying his hand upon the ſacrifice. Its true God by reaſon of his juſtice cannot deſtroy or afflict his creature by way of puniſhment, unleſs it be for ſinne, for they two are neceſſarily conjoyned; but ſimply to kill or deſtroy from his dominion and ſupream power, he may without any ſhadow of wrong; yea ſuch is Gods infinitenes, and we are ſo totally depending on him in all things, that he cannot do us any injury at all.

And as for the ſecond inſtance, we muſt confeſs that it did much perplex *Auſtin* of old, to anſwer *Fauſtus* the Manichee, who held, that the God of the Old Teſtament was not the ſame

same with the God of the New, and they bring this particular, where God is said to command the people both to lie and steal from the Egyptians: but we shall answer to the first thing, that which seems to be stealing and robbing; secondly, to the manner, that which seemeth to be lying and defrauding. For the former, it was not theft or robbery in the Israelites to take the Egyptians goods; for God (as you heard) who is the Lord of all things, he may take the goods that one man injoyeth and give them to another, and this he doth when men have wickedly abused them to his dishonour. Now the Egyptians had abused their gold and silver to Idolatry, they had oppressed the Israelites and not paid them for their work and service; God therefore whose is the earth and the fulness thereof, he bestoweth those goods upon the Israelites: Even as he took the Land of *Canaan* from the Nations that were the lawfull possessors thereof, for their impiety and wickedness, and gave it to the Israelites. Thus we are in these instances to have an eye upon Gods dominion, and although he hath given such good things to the inhabitants of the earth, yet he hath not alienated his dominion, or propriety, but he is Lord still, and therefore when any abuses the mercies he betrusteth them with, he takes them away and giveth them to others. But you must know that though God doth thus, yet men may not upon presumption that other men are wicked and unworthy adventure to do so, being bound by the Law of a Superiour, but God is not so tied: And by this we may answer that question, Whether God can dispense with the Law and duties of nature, or the morality of any of the ten Commandments, to give a man leave not to love him, or to lye and steal? For seeing God is thus holy and righteous, he cannot approve of, or command any thing that is intrinsecally a sinne, or dispence with any duty that is intrinsecally good, for the Decalogue in the moral part of it, is of eternal, immutable and perpetual verity. As the fire burneth in every Country alike, so what is naturally just and righteous, is every where so. Even *Tully, lib. 3. de rep.* could say, that the Law of nature was such a Law, *Nec prorogari fas est, nec derogarve hac aliquid licet, nec totâ abrogari potest.*

potest, non per Senatum or *per populum* can we be freed from this Law: yea God himself, because his holy Will is an eternal Law to himself, cannot free the creature from it. Indeed some Schoolmen have said, No action is intrinsecally evil, but becomes so, because God forbids it, and therefore say that usual position, Some things are evil because prohibited, Some things are prohibited because evil, is true only with man, not with God, with whom they say nothing is evil unless because of his prohibition. Hence is that detestable position of *Mayso, lib. sent. dist.* 17. *qu.* 1. That God might have made a Law, that whosoever shall blaspheme him should be blessed in heaven, and whosoever should praise him should be thrown into hell. But the bitter root of such opinions is, because they hold nothing is intrinsecally evil or good. Its true if we speak of actions in their physical entity, so there is no evil intrinsecal to them; but take them as moral actions, so to hate God, to lie or steal can never be but sinnes. The Israelites action therefore in taking the Egyptians goods, was not theft, not that God dispensed with his Law, but altered the object and propriety; so that by the true Master of all, that which was the Egyptians is now become the true possession of the Israelites. And further, Theft is the taking of another mans goods against his will, but God did so bow the Egyptians hearts, that they willingly gave them their goods. Hence *Exod.* 12. 36. where it is translated *the Egyptians lent them*, according to the Hebrew it is, *They even made and provoked the Israelites to ask of them*, they were so willing to help them. And as for the later doubt, which the Manichees objected, God by *Moses* taught them to lye and defraud, for they borrowed these goods of the Egyptians, intending to spoil them thereby. Its true *Austin* could not well resolve it, but said, Though we cannot tell how they did well, yet we are to believe it. But though we translate the word *borrowing*, yet the Hebrew word is for to *ask* and *require*, therefore we cannot from the text prove any more then that they did crave and ask those goods of the Egyptians, and although there was no reason why they should grant them such a request, the Egyptians having been such oppressing enemies alwaies

alwaies of them; yet here appeared Gods wonderfull power, that he could so suddenly turn their hearts and make them favourable to them. *Bonfrerius* the Jesuite *in loc.* saith, they might lawfully borrow those Jewels of the Egyptians, and yet be not guilty of any fraud, though they paid them not again, because there was such a condition implied, Unless these goods prove to be our own, and thus it was with them. But though the Israelites in borrowing did not reveal all the truth, yet they denied none; and its not necessary in every case to reveal all the truth, though it be alwaies necessary to deny none.

The third instance is from *Hosea* 1.3. Gods command to *Hosea*, that he should *take a woman of whoredoms to wife*. This instance hath also much tortured the thoughts of most Learned men; yea great parties have been made about it. There are three several waies of Interpretation, all which have Learned abettors, but which way soever it fall, there will not appear any thing as if God did love or command unrighteousnes. *Ribera* the Jesuite holds that the Prophet did really take a notorious whore to wife, though by her marriage to the Prophet she became holy, and so the scandal was taken away, and for this he alleadgeth many Authors; but this seemeth not probable, and therefore *Tarnovius* doth by many solid reasons confute this, *Exercitat. Bibl.* 605. In the second place *Tarnovius* following *Luther*, saith, The Prophet took a godly sober woman to wife, but put those infamous names upon her and her children, thereby to admonish the people of *Israel*, that they were guilty of such whoredoms. The third is of *Rivet* and others, who make this not to be really done by the Prophet, no not so much as in vision, but understood it as a Parable, Go thou and propheſie to the people of *Israel*, who have indeed been married to the Lord, but they have proved full of whoredome: and they are called the Prophets wife, because he was now in a special manner by his propheſie to take care of them. This is thought to be the most genuine interpretation, and accompanied with least inconveniencies, for though it depart from the letter of the text, yet that is lawfull, when in the letter there is any

indecent or dishonest thing commanded, as was of old observed. But as for our purpose, in none of these is any unrighteous thing commanded; no not in the first interpretation, because they say, this woman, though formerly an whore, yet by the Prophets marriage of her was reduced to a sober and chast life. And that much for the direction of your understandings in those famous instances.

Obj. 2. A second doubt, which not only the Learned, but the ignorant, yet all make, is, *That if God thus love righteous men in all the several wales, as hath been shewed, How comes to pass then, that many times the righteous man is in a worse outward condition then the wicked? that he may perish in his righteousness? Do not these glorious words seem to be like a deceitfull brook to the weary traveller? and do not Divines, when they answer this Objection by several distinctions, as the Assumers, who when they are not able to answer many arguments, fain Orbs and Epicycles in the Heavens? Is not experience against all this?*

Answ. To which we Answer, Though God hath made such promises to the righteous, yet seeing none is absolutely and compleatly righteous, its no wonder if they meet with several afflictions for those reliques of corruption abiding in them. In heaven, there the righteous is compassed about with all blessedness, because he is inwardly perfected with all righteousness, as in the upper region there are no disturbing Meteors: But we are not in this life so high, and therefore being subject to many unrighteous, unholy thoughts and actions, its no wonder that we have the rod sometimes on our backs.

1. 2. There are many particular exercises of righteousness, as its taken for the universal rectitude of the whole man, which cannot be demonstrated but under afflictions and calamities. Now God will have us put forth every kinde of righteousness: Were there not afflictions we could not discover our patience and humility, no nor such love to God, and obedience to him; afflictions being like the winde that bloweth upon the flower, which makes it smell the sweeter, and like the pounding of Frankincense, that is the more fragrant.

3. God

3. God though he afflict the righteous, yet cannot be said to hate them, yea he loveth them the more; and did he not love them, he would not chasten them, for *whom God loveth he chasteneth*, Rom. 5. and *Heb.* 5. *Without this we are bastards and no children.* Now the love of God in afflicting his own children, is discovered, In the original of afflictions, In the final cause of them, and In the effects thereof. 3.

In the Original, for they come from Gods tender love; though he be angry, yet its an anger of love, and therefore whom God taxeth he will not punish; yea he delivers them up to their lusts without any affliction to hinder them; so that thou maiest from those very afflictions say, Now I know the Lord loveth me, that he will not let me runne with all delight in the waies of sinne; as *David* confessed it was Gods faithfulnes to afflict him, for till then he went astray, *Psal.* 119. 75.

2. There is love in the Final cause, God therefore chastiseth the righteous, that sinne may be bitter, that the light of his countenance may the more to them then all the world; that they may be weary of this *Egypt*, and long for *Canaan*; Were not these thorns put under us sometimes, we should lie down too sweetly and securely in the bosom of the creatures, so that some afflictions are as necessary as thy food and raiment to thee: This rod of correction beats out the folly in thy heart, this filing of thee takes off thy rust.

3. There is love in the Effects thereof, for being sanctified by God, they purge from sinne, they consume the drosse, they winnow away the chaff, and are the happy physick which God the wise Physitian administers to the soul; so that although, as the Apostle saith, *No affliction is for the present joyous, but grievous*, Heb. 12. 11. yet the effect thereof is peace and righteousnes. There is not any affliction God hath brought on thee, but thou wilt say in the end thereof, that God loved thee, therefore he did so to thee, yea thou wilt bless God, as *David* did, for those chastisements; Who was I that the Lord did take such notice of me, that he hedged in my way with thorns? Oh I had been undone, if I had found the way to sin broad and open!

Lastly, These afflictions are of love, if you consider the usefulness and serviceableness of them to assure and evidence unto us the truth of our grace, for when we shall continue in the way of righteousness, when there is no earthly incouragement, yea when there are all outward discheartnings, This is a sign we love righteousness for righteousness sake: as *Jacobs* love was manifested to be unfained, when he endured all that hardship for *Rachel*. *Job* discovered the sincerity of his heart, when he would trust in God and depend on him, even then when God seemed to be most against him. He did to God, that which *Paul* speaks of the *Galatians*, he loved them, though they loved him the less. When righteousness and prosperity go together, thou canst not tell to which thy heart doth most adhere: as a servant behind two great Lords, you cannot tell to which he belongs till you see them part: Thus when righteousness and outward advantages go together, you cannot well tell which you love best; but when it cometh to this, that thou must part with righteousness or worldly profits, and thou wilt readily leave the later, to enjoy the former, this declareth the soundness of thy graces: That thou art like the sea, which though never so much water rain upon it, yet that keeps its natural salt and saltness. Thus though afflictions one after another come upon thee, yet thou doest not repent of thy righteousness, but art resolved to live holily, though for its sake thou looseſt goods, honours, and life it self.

Obj. 3. I shall only mention one Objection more: *If God be Righteous and that loveth righteousness, then how comes it about that he suffers sinne to be, which he can so easily hinder; yea how are those many places of Scripture to be understood, which attribute even the evil of sin to him? Thus God is said to harden* Pharaohs *heart*, Exod 4.21. Joseph *tels his brethren that it was not they, but God that sold him*, Gen 45.8. David *saith, God bid* Shimei *curse him*, 2 Sam.16. *God bid the lying spirit go and be in the mouth of the Prophets*, 2 Chron.18.21. *God is said to give men up to their lusts*, Rom.1. *God is said to give men up to strong delusions to believe a lye*, 2 Thess 2.11. *Yea that great sinne of killing the Lord Christ, is said to be forordained by the hand and*

counsel of God, Acts 2. 23. Acts 4. 28.

I acknowledge this is a deep Point, and requireth a large Tractate, it hath exercised both the Ancient and later Teachers in the Church of God: But so farre as it may relate to our matter in hand, I shall answer in some particulars; and the rather because *Lorinus* the Jesuite from this text, *God loveth righteousness*, doth charge the Protestants as making God the author of sinne, and so to love sinne as well as righteousness. To clear this, consider first, That in the doctrine of Gods will about sinne, some speak in the defect, and some run into a blasphemous excess. The Papists would conclude all that God wils or doth about sinne, under a meer bare permission, though in the explication some use more rigid and hard expressions then the Protestants do. But certainly these Scripture expressions before mentioned, signifie more then a bare permission. In the excess run those blasphemous Libertines, against whom *Calvin* wrote, that made God the author of all the sins they committed, saying it was not they that did thus and thus, but God in them, as some slate have written blasphemously to that purpose. But the truth lieth between these, it goeth not to the right hand or left: for its certain the Scripture attributeth such actions as are sins to God, even as it doth at other times hands and eyes; so that all the difficulty is, how we must understand these and not blaspheme the holy Nature of God. Learned men alledge a speech of *Hugo*, Godly souls are started when they hear God wils sin, *viz.* to be, and they abhor it, *Non quia non bene dicitur, sed quia non bene intelligitur.* In the first place therefore, let this be laid down as a firm Conclusion, That *God cannot properly and positively will sinne in others, or sinne himself, or tempt, and encourage, or incite others to sin, neither can he be the author of sin.* The Sun may suffer an eclipse and lose the manifestation of light, but *James* 1. with God there is no shadow of change. The Word of God speaks wholly to this purpose, *Psal.* 5. *Thou art not a God that willest iniquity*: The Hebrew word signifieth to take pleasure and delight in it: yea *Hab.* 1. his eyes are so pure they cannot indure to behold it. Thus whatsoever anger or wrath you reade God hath, its only against sin; for this

Answ.

all his judgements are; for this he hath appointed those eternal flames of hell; so that though the damned creature lieth roaring to all eternity, yet he cannot get a day of ease; how then can God be said to Love or Will that which he only abhorreth, and hath decreed to punish with such unspeakable torments? *James* 1. 23. doth directly speak to this, *God is not tempted, nor can he tempt others, but every one is seduced by his own lusts*: And indeed there are strong reasons for this: First, Because of the perfect and infinite Knowledge in God, whereby he knoweth evil in all the abhorrency and vileness of it; so that if God should sinne (pardon the supposition) it would be against the greatest light that ever was, which is the highest aggravation of a sin, as we see in the Apostate Angels; but Gods Knowledge is so perfect, that no evil can insinuate into him. 2. Gods holy Nature and Will is the rule and measure of all righteousness; so that if it were possible for God to Will a sin, it would by his willing of it cease to be sin, it would thereby be made good; so that we may better say, there can be no such thing as sin, then that God can Will it. 3. Sin hath no proper efficient but a deficient cause; now the perfection of God is so Infinite and Absolute, that there cannot be any defect conceived in him: Therefore not only in the Church of God, but even amongst the wisest Heathens, this hath been an ingrafted principle, that God could not Will sin. Therefore take heed of charging thy sins upon God, thou canst not help it, God giveth not thee the grace he doth others. This we are prone to, as appeareth by *Adam* at first, *The Woman thou gavest me, bid me eat*: So by the Apostles exhortation, *James* 1. *Let no man say God tempted him*, for how canst thou charge God thus foolishly, when he hath implanted a conscience to accuse and arraign thee upon the commission of sin? Though none know of it, yet thou feareſt and tremblest, which made *Seneca* say, *Maxima peccantium pœna est, peccasse, and sceleris in scelere supplicium est*. Whence come those fears and horrors, if God did not hate sin?

Sect.

SERM. V.

A Modest Enquiry into Gods Providence about sinne. How farre he works about it, and yet no sinne to be imputed to him. And why God lets sinne to be.

PSAL. 11. 7.

The Righteous Lord, loveth Righteousnesse.

GOD (we have heard) is neither the willer or author of sinne. This both Scripture, and the reason of Men there have acknowledged; yet seeing that sinne could not be, if God would hinder it, and therefore both at the same time it is *contra voluntatem Dei*, yet not *sine Dei voluntate*; and seeing the Scripture in many places doth so clearly ascribe such things as are sins to God. Let us modestly enquire into Gods Providence about sinne, how farre he works about it, and yet no sinne to be imputed to him. Modestly (I say) because in this Subject we doe nature doth often runne to a *modus excusationis, sed semper falsus*, and a *modus inexplicabilis, sed semper explicabilis*. Yea that profound Doctor *Bradwardine de causa Dei*, cap. 32. after he had in a most sublime manner descanted of this Theme, he ends his Chapter with this, *In magnitudine divinæ quæstionis modicus mensuræ auditor, quum ego minimus fi-*

Mink.

Wherein Gods will is conversant about sin, and wherein it is not.

That we may therefore avoid all rocks, let us consider first how farre, or wherein Gods will is conversant about sin, and wherein it is not. And

I.

First, *This is agreed upon by all, that God hath a permissive will about sinne.* He doth not simply and absolutely will it, nor yet peremptorily nill it, for then it could not be, but he wils the suffering of it. This permissive will of God is an efficacious will in some sense; for it is not as when a man saith to another, Do what you will, I will have no hand in it one way or other, but its truly and really a will, not of the sinne but of the permission of sinne, only the Orthodox call it a permissive will, in opposition to that approving and efficacious will God hath in good things, for the good things that are, God doth both *facere* and *ordinare*, make and order, but evil things he doth not make, onely he orders them. The word then is used to shew a difference between Gods will in good things and in evil; so that its a wretched calumny of the Papists, as if the Orthodox did hold, That *Judas* his betraying of Christ, was as much willed by God, as *Peters confession* of him. We grant, that God hath a permissive will, as *Genes.*20. God told *Abimelech, He had not suffered him to commit sinne*; only we say, Permission is not all God doth, and the Scripture expressions of Gods work about sin, signifie more then that; only when we say, God permits sin to be, we must not take permission in such a sense, as when Christ said, *Moses suffered the Israelites to give a bill of Divorce for the hardnesse of their heart*; for according to some mens opinion, that permission made such repudiating to be no sin: nor is it in such sense, as when its disputed, whether a Magistrate may suffer stew-houses or hereticks; for in that sense, though permission doth not signifie an acquittance from sinne, yet an immunity from punishment; but God never permits sinne in any such sense; only by permission we mean Gods will not to impede or hinder a man from sinning, when if he please he can do it immediately. Therefore *Gibieuf* expresseth it well, That God doth not *permittere potestati, sed potentiæ, lib. 2. de liber.* he doth not permit it, that any one shall have right or priviledge, and impunity to sinne; but to the powers or faculties

faculties of the soul, by not restraining them. This permissive will of God must needs be acknowledged; for who can say, sinne comes into the world absolutely against Gods will, he would have hindered it, but could not; this is to make Gods will not omnipotent, and mans will stronger then his.

Hence in the second place, *Let us say no more in Gods will about sinne, then the Scriptures, and plain reason will compell men, yet we shall never be able to satisfie cavilling spirits.* For grant but this bare permissive will; will not the prophane man cavil and say, Why doth God suffer me to runne headlong into sinne? Why doth he see me tumbling and falling, and doth not reach out his hand? If a man should see a blind man running head-long upon deep pits and precepies, it would be a sinne in a man not to stop that blinde man; yet God seeth blinde, infirm, miserable man falling into sinne, but doth not stay him. Thus prophane men would cavill, and all, because *they would have God obliged and tied by such Laws, as man is:* Yea, if we do grant a fore-knowledge in God barely about sinne, that he fore-knew when he created *Adam*, that he would sinne and undo all his posterity, at this the froward heart of man will cavill, as well as at any thing else. This is good to be observed, because of some men who affect new opinions, thinking thereby to stop every froward spirit in this point; for that's impossible; for seeing God doth permit sinne, *Sciens & volens*, and if man should do this, it would be blame-worthy in him, we must needs acknowledge, that God is not bound by such Laws, as man his creature is.

Thirdly, *Gods will, yea and his working or causality goeth to the material of every sinne.* He produceth every act to which sinne is annexed, though not the sinne, *In him we live, and move, and have our being*; the tongue of the blasphemer, the hand of the thief could not move to sinne, did not God inable thereunto; only as man doth it, he sinneth, because he is deficient from that rule, whereby he ought to walk, but God who is perfection it self cannot deviate from his eternal law of holinesse within himself. This indeed hath greatly 3.

exercised some, how God can produce the act of sinne to which deformity is annexed, and yet not be the author of sinne; and the rather, because sinne being either a *privation*, or else as others a *positive relation* at most, it cannot be brought about any other way then by causing the *fundamentum*, which is the *material act* to which sinne adhereth; As the withdrawing of light doth thereby produce darknesse, and darknesse cannot otherwise come to be, there cannot be any positive efficiency of it: Neither will it avail to say, God wills not sinne *quâ* sin, in this action, for so neither doth man, it being not possible that a man intending evil, should thereby work it, for evil *quâ* evil is not the object of the will, no more then *falsum quâ falsum* can be of the understanding; how then to clear God, and yet make man culpable, is the great work to be done; and those emphatical expressions of the Scripture about Gods will concerning sinne made those *Libertines Calvin* wrote against *Opusc. ad liber.* attribute not only the *actions*, but the *decree* and ordination thereof to God, whereby they could not endure that it should be said, Such a man murdered or committed adultery: They said it was blasphemy to say so, because it was Gods work not mans. Thus, saith *Calvin*, they transformed God into the devil, and made him equal, if not worse, then him. But as the Cloud was light to the *Israelites*, and darknesse to the *Ægyptians*; so the Scripture is a Rule of light and order to godly, sober mindes, but a cause of stumbling and offence to carnal, vain hearts. But you may say, How can it be that the same action proceeding from God, and from man, that it should be a sinne as it cometh from man, and not from God? Some to avoid this, as *Durand* of old, and *Dudo* of late, have maintained, that God hath no immediate concourse or efficiency in our actions: God, say they, created man with a power and ability to do such and such actions, he giveth him onely the power, and man acteth afterwards wholly of himself. But the Scripture speaketh otherwayes, *In him we live and move*; and if this were so, then God could not represse the action of a creature without destroying the power; but we reade, God hindered the fire

from

from burning; and yet it remained fire having a power to burn.

Others, they say, Therefore God is not the cause of the sinne, though of the action, because he cooperateth only in the way of a *physical* or natural cause, not *moral*, by approving, counselling or allaying of it, as *Canus* and *Vasquez*: but that is not satisfactory.

Bellarmine, and so most of the *Jesuites*, they say, God is freed, because he concurreth onely as an universal cause, he offereth his aid, as that which is indifferent, and so by man is used to a good or bad action. But certainly this cannot clear God; for how unworthy is it to conceive of God thus? As if he should say to man, Here I give you assistance, use it as you please, either to a good or an evil action. *Bradwardine* solidly confuted this Assertion of old, *De causa Dei lib. 3. cap. 29. Constanter & liberè voco dico, illum nolo pro Deo habere, &c.* I cannot hold him for a God, whose most blessed will, I a most wicked sinner can *valeat multorum debilem opprimere & necessitare abhorribilem actum peccati* necessitate to sin. This is to make God (saith he) *Servitutis peccatoris miserabiliter subjectum.*

Again, If Gods concourse be thus indifferent to a good or bad action, then that which they slander the Protestants with, may truly be retorted on them, That God worked no more for *Peters* confession of him, then he did for *Judas* his betraying of him. The good is no more of him, then the evil.

Therfore *Bradwardine* he grants, That seeing God doth will the act, to which sinne is annexed necessarily, he doth also will the sinne, yet sinne is not imputed to God, because he doth not *absolutely* will it, but *secundum quid*: Yea, he saith, that in respect of God, who is the universal cause, there is no sinne, that sinne is so called onely in respect of a particular cause, for to God both *mala* and *bona* are *bona*, seeing he orders all sinne to good, yea to a greater good, then sinne can be evil. Thus *Joseph* told his brethren, *You thought evil to me, but God turned it to good.* But the most solid answer may be, That though God doth enable to that act, to which sinne

adhereth, yet God doth neither ſinne, nor cauſe man to ſin, becauſe what God doth, he doth moſt perfectly, nor is tied to hinder ſinne; but man works in a defective manner, not according to the Rule; ſo that ſinne is immediately from the inſtrument man, or the devil, which God uſeth, not from God; as the Sunne-beams ſhining upon a noiſome carcaſſe, the ill ſmell is not to be attributed to the Sunne, but to the dung-hill.

Others ſay, As a man that driveth a lame horſe, he is the cauſe of the horſes motion, but the lameneſſe is from the horſe; or as a man that writeth, the motion of the pen is from the hand, but the blotting and blurring is from ſome unfitneſſe in the pen. Or laſtly, as the Muſician is the cauſe of the Tune upon the inſtruments ſtring, but that there is any harſhneſſe or jarring, is from the inſtrument it ſelf: So then conclude of this truth as moſt certain, that all thoſe actions or motions to which ſinne cleaveth, as they have a phyſical entity, or natural being, muſt needs be from God, the chief and firſt being; as every ſtream muſt needs come from the fountain; hence is that Rule, *Omne malum fundatur in bono*, there cannot be a pure and meer evil, but it muſt adhere to ſome natural good.

4. Fourthly, *As God doth thus concurre to the act of ſin; ſo alſo he doth will ſinne as a puniſhment.* Thus in thoſe places forementioned, where God is ſaid to *harden*, or *to give up to luſts*, it is to be underſtood as theſe ſins are puniſhments. Nor can this be any love to ſinne, but a terrible demonſtration of his wrath againſt it. Some have denied that one ſinne can be a puniſhment of another, but the Scripture is very clear in this, he is not the cauſe of the evil in the puniſhment, but of the puniſhment in the evil: for although ſin as it is ſin is voluntary to the ſinner, and ſo he findes a delight in it: Yet as by this he is left by God to run more obſtinately in wayes of ſin, and be thereby at laſt deprived of all happineſſe; ſo it is a miſery and a puniſhment. Indeed God did not will the firſt ſin by way of puniſhment, but as *Auguſtine* obſerveth all ſins ſince the firſt, are both ſins, cauſes of ſin, and puniſhments of ſin: Although as *Pererius* well obſerveth, Thoſe efficacian-

an words the Scripture uſeth are not applied to every ſinne or ſinner, but to ſuch as are notorious and in a more then ordinary manner left by God, as *Pharaoh* and the *Jews* for abuſing ſuch mercies. Its no wonder then if God be ſaid to will ſin as a puniſhment, for that is good, and an act of juſtice, yea it would be abſurd to ſay, God onely ſuffers or permits that, for in this God doth demonſtrate his holy and righteous nature, and hereby evil is made good; and as *Augustine* ſaith, *Inordinationem non inordinatum relinquit.* Neither may we ſay, How can ſin being a privation come from God the Judge? for we ſee even in humane judicatories, when the puniſhment is *privative*, as the loſſe of honour or goods, yet the judgement about it is poſitive.

Fifthly, *God may be ſaid to will ſinne not as ſinne, but as it is a means to declare his juſtice or mercy.* Although ſin be not in it ſelf *medium per ſe*, of any good, no more then venome or poiſon is of health, yet by the wiſdome of God, its made conducible to thoſe wiſe and holy ends which he intends, and in this ſenſe its true, then even *mala* are *bona*, in reſpect of Gods ordering of them for a greater good, then evil ſuffered can be evil; and howſoever the Papiſts calumniate this expreſſion, yet *Gibieuf* expreſſly aſſerts it, *lib. 2. de liber.* Evil (ſaith he) may be ſo either *per modum objecti*, as if it were an object to be deſired or approved of, or elſe *per modum medii*, as it may be uſed by God for advancing his glory, and ſo God doth will it. Neither doth God herein offend againſt that Rule, *We may not do evil that good may come of it*, for God doth not do evil, his permitting of evil to be, is good, though the evil be not good. 5.

Sixthly, *Gods work and will about ſin is ſeen in the denying of that grace which if the ſinner had he would not offend.* And thus God may be ſaid to cauſe ſinne, as *removens prohibens*; As he that withdraweth a pillar or foundation of a houſe, may be ſaid to pull down the houſe: Gods denying of grace is either meerly *negative*, when he doth not at firſt offer or vouchſafe it to man. Thus the Heathens live without the knowledge or offer of ſaving grace: Or ſecondly, *Privative*, when he doth withdraw ſuch grace, either in whole or in part, that he beſtoweth 6.

floweth on sometimes: Thus many unregenerate men, though they had not true sanctifying grace, yet they had many workings and mollifyings of Gods Spirit, which they neglecting and contemning, God in a just judgement denieth them any such workings any more. Thus God is said *to make the eyes of the Israelites blinde, and their ears deaf, and their hearts hard*, not by infusing any wickednesse into them, but by denying such softning or preparatory works that they have upon them. Thus the Sun may be said to harden by withdrawing its beams, and he may be said to kill a man that takes away the food and sustenance he should live on. A terrible judgement it is, and the portion only of such who live within the means of grace, and abuse them; men are sensible of judgements upon their bodies, their estates, but not upon their souls: How doth a man complain that hath lost his eyes, it makes him weary of his life? Yet how many hundreds are there that are deprived of the spiritual eye, and yet lay it not to heart? neither stand with the blinde man, where Christ is to come in his Ordinances, praying, *Lord, that we may receive our sight!*

7. Seventhly, *Gods will and work in sin is seen by delivering up to Satan, letting him have power and dominion to do what he will.* Thus into the false prophets God sent lying spirits, and *Judas* had the devil entring into his heart, *Joh.* 13. 27. Oh there are many prophane, cursing wretches that have nothing more in their mouths then this! The devil take them, and that proveth too true. The devil hath taken thy soul, the better part of thee already. Its he that keepeth all at peace within thee, though a childe of the devil, though in gall and wormwood, yet thou playest, riotest and runnest into all excess; whence is this obstinateness and wilfulness, but because the devil is in thy heart. As the godly are filled with the holy Ghost, whereby they boldly speak the things of God in the midst of all dangers; so wicked men being filled with the devil, can drink, swear, be prophane, and contemn all the thoughts of hell and damnation. As we see in the *Ægyptians*, they ventured to go into the sea, when it was made dry for the *Israelites*, they feared not but boldly go on, and then on a sudden the waters

waters overwhelm them. Thus do wicked men, they boldly and desperately venture upon such and such a sin, which when committed, at last Gods anger ariseth to their utter perdition. Oh then be afraid lest thy sins be so great that God deliver thee up to the devil! And as the bodily possessed, were thrown sometimes into the water, and sometimes into the fire; so thou falleſt, sometimes in one grievous sin, and sometimes in another; when God leaveth thee thus to sin and Satan, he doth, saith *Chrysostom*, as if a great Captain should forsake his Army in the midst of their cruel enemies upon which ruine followeth inevitably.

Lastly, *Gods will and work about sin is in removing all those externals that might curb sin, he will not chasten or afflict them*, as *Hos.* 4. 14. so *Ephraim is joyned to idols, let him alone*; or else he removeth the Word and faithful Ministers, and when they are thus in the dark, they must needs fall: or if God do continue such mercies, as he did wonderful things to *Pharaoh*, it is to harden them more. These mercies fat them to destruction: These Sun-beams do the more blinde them: and therefore that is one way that *Austin* acknowledged God hardens by his patience: three wayes he may do it, 1. *Per Permissionem.* 2. *Patientiam*, 3. *Potentiam.* Thus whatsoever befals the wicked man it becomes a snare to him, it furthers his sin and damnation. 8. 84

In the next place, you may ask, Why doth God suffer sin thus to be? and here as *Gibieuf lib. 2. de liber.* observeth, we may better ask for a reason of the sin suffered, then of Gods will suffering it, for that is to ask a cause of Gods will, which cannot be, for then there were a greater thing then that, but in common speech we say, God doth will sin to be for these ends, Why God suffers sin to be.

1. *That thereby Christ may be exalted and magnified*; Out of sinne God works the greatest good, even Christ our Mediator, which made *Gregory* say, *Felix culpa, quæ talem meruit habere redemptorem*, if sin had not been, Christ had not been.

2. *God by the permission of sin exalts his attributes*, of justice in punishing, of mercy and grace in forgiving, and of wisdom in

in ordering of it; let us not then prophanely cavil at the being of sin, but heartily admire all the glorious attributes of God exalted thereby, as sin hath abounded, so Gods grace and mercy hath abounded.

3. *God makes sin turn to the very good of him that committed it*, because *Paul* was a blasphemer and a persecutor, the chiefest sinner of all, therefore he was more humble then all. This made *Austin* say, *Audeo dicere, quod utile est superbiæ in aliquod manifestum peccatum incidere.*

4. *By sin committed, the graces of the godly are more orient and glorious.* Contraries do illustrate one another. As in speech there is a figure called *Antithesis*, whereby the oration is more glorious, so there is, saith *Austin*, an *eloquentia rerum*, by evil good is more praised. Thus the dark night sets out the day, the dark shadows in the picture adorn it, and the pauses or silence in singing make the melody sweeter.

Lastly, *Many excellent graces in the godly could never have been demonstrated, had not God suffered wicked men to satisfie their will.* The patience, zeal and fortitude of *Martyrs* were seen by the wickedness of *Nero* and *Diocletian* persecutors. As the *Gardner* (saith *Plutarch*) sets his garlick and unsavoury herbs near his violets and roses, that so their sweet smell may be the more diffused; thus God makes the goodnesse of the godly admirable by the wickednesse of the wicked.

Use of Admonition, to adore that wisdome and power of God, who can and doth turn all the wickednesse in the world to such wonderful good; so that the godly may say, their sins, yea and the sins of the Churches enemies have been happy sins. If a man come into the Artificers shop, he admireth at all the crooked and toothed instruments that are, to what use they be: but the Artificer makes curious and polished materials by such instruments; even thus God doth with all wicked men,

SECT.

SECT. II.

Of Christs Sufferings, Merit and Satisfaction.

SERM. VI.

That all men through Adams *Transgreſſion are plunged into Sinne, curſed by the Law, and obnoxious to the wrath of God, which is alſo upon them and cannot be removed, unleſs there be a way of Satisfaction found out. That Chriſt voluntarily became man, and offered himſelf as a Sacrifice upon the Croſs to ſatisfie Gods Juſtice and expiate our Sinnes.*

ROM. 3. 26.

To declare (I ſay) at this time his Righteouſneſs, that he might be Juſt, and the Juſtifier of him which beleeveth in Jeſus.

FRom *verſ.* 25. to the end of this *verſ.* 26. we have a Divine and Theological deſcription of our Juſtification; ſo that both the matter deſcribed, and the manner of the deſcription are admirable. As there is the Song of Songs, and was the Holy of Holies, ſo this part

of Scripture may be called *Evangelium Evangelii*, the Gospel of the Gospel, it being the summe and breviary of it. This noble and divine priviledge of Justification is described in all the causes of it, the *efficient*, which is the grace of God; the *material* or meritorious cause, Christ crucified; the *instrumental* cause, Faith; and which is observable, not only *Cajetan*, but *Lapide in locum*, do acknowledge and call faith the *causa applicans* of our Justification. Lastly, There is the *final cause*, and that for the notableness of it is twice repeated, *vers.* 25. and in my Text. For though the former preposition be εἰς, and the later πρὸς, yet that cannot make any difference, as some would have it. Therefore our Interpreters adde [*I say*] to declare [*I say*] as hereby intimating how worthy it is of our observation and notice again and again. Thus we have this Scripture, like the grain of mustard-seed, little in quantity, but it will grow up into a vast tree; so (that if we may allegorize) both the birds of the air may build their nests here, the sublime and most penetrating understandings may finde a subject imploying them to the full; and the beasts of the field, even prophane and wicked men, but sensible and weary of their sinnes, may come and finde a shadow of refreshment from this Text. So truly might *Calvin in loc.* say, *Non est insignior locus*, there is not a more signal and eminent place in all the Scripture for describing the nature of our Justification, then this: And if the true doctrine of Justification be *the Pillar of the Church*, this is the Pillar of that Pillar. My work is only to treat on *the final cause*, expressed in this *vers.* 26. Which is set down, 1. *Generally*, *To declare his Righteousness*, with the circumstance of time when, [*at this time.*] 2. This final cause is distributed into the *finis cujus*, *That he may be Just*, and the *finis cui*, a *Justifier of him that believeth*. Let us consider the final cause first as generally set down, πρὸς ἔνδειξιν: *Budæus* makes the word properly to signifie that dilation or complaint which men made against such who were guilty of *male*-administration in the publique; but here it is the same with ἔνδειγμα that is used 2 *Thess.* 1. 5. a very pregnant place to expound this: yea we have the word in the text used for the same purpose, *Rom.* 9. 22. *What*

if

if God willing to shew his wrath? But all the difficulty is, what is meant by δικαιοσύνη, righteousnes here; for in the Scripture, especially in *Pauls* Epistles, the Righteousnes of God is taken two waies, either for the *attribute* whereby he is righteous, or else for that righteousnes whereby we are justified, which the Apostle often cals *the Righteousnes of God*, either because its of Gods procuring, or of his imputing, or because acceptable to him; of which more in its time. Howsoever some Papists understand this of the later righteousnes, following *Austin*, not *quâ Deus justus est*, but *quâ induit hominem*; yet the context doth evidence the former: only if meant of the former, then the question is, Whether righteousnes be not taken for the goodnes and mercy of God, as in many places it is; and speaking thus of the grace of God in our Justification, it might seem to favour this interpretation. Thus *inconstant Grotius* in his Comment upon the place understands it, it seemeth at his later end *Socinianizing*, so that he kept his worst wine to the last, and his *secundæ cogitationes* were *pejores*; for in his defence of Christs Satisfaction against *Socinus*, pag. 24, 25. he doth with strong reason evince, that by righteousnes is not meant Gods mercy, but that property in God whereby he is prone to punish sinne, and there are two reasons for this interpretation: First, because *Paul* doth oppose this time wherein God appointed Christ to die for our sinnes, unto the time of the old Testament, where God had a πάφεσις, which is not a remission, but a transmission of the punishment of sinne: God did not exact in the old Testament the price or satisfaction for our sinnes, but deferred it till the times of the Gospel: Not but that the Fathers then had pardon of sinne, and God did by many visible temporal judgements punish the wicked, but the expiatory service was not performed till Christ came, though the benefit of it did extend to times past, because Christs death did work as a meritorious and so a moral cause; now for a moral cause to work its not necessary it should exist immediatly, its enough if it have *esse cognitum*, as the Schools say, that there be a minde which knoweth it and looks to it, as God did. Gods time then in the old Testament was a for-

bearance or putting off the punishment of sinne, called therefore ἀνοχὴ. *Chrysostom* observeth well (though *Sixtus Senensis* saith its false, whereas he is deceived, following the Vulgar translation) that ὑπομονὴ patience is never attributed to God, because God cannot be said to suffer: but either μακροθυμία, or here in the Text ἀνοχὴ. This is the first reason. Secondly, By Righteousnes we must understand the justice of God, because Christ is here said to be a *propitiation, and that through his blood*; so that although the grace of God be discovered in our Justification, so also is Gods justice, for therefore Christ shed his blood to appease the wrath of God; and he is called here the *propitiation*, in allusion to the Mercy-seat made of pure gold, wherein God doth graciously reveal his will as reconciled, called therefore a *placator* or *reconciler*. This is a cogent reason, and thus *Cajetan* and *Parens* take righteousnes; and in this sense righteousnes is often used, 2 *Thess.* 1.6. *Heb.* 2,2. *Act.* 17.31. The last day of judgement is said to be in δικαιοσύνη, *Rom.* 16.5,7. Indeed learned *Cameron* noteth upon *ver.* 21. that the righteousnes of God is used alwaies for his goodnes, mercy and salvation, and that it is never used to signifie that which we call justice, whereby God punisheth sinne. But *Lodov. de Dieu* upon this Text, doth solidly confute that assertion, shewing that although sometimes it may signifie the mercy of God, yet often, and most properly its attributed to God, as the just Judge of the world; and he instanceth in some places above mentioned, adding also, *Isa.* 59.16. and so saith he it must be understood in this Text, for God sheweth his privative and vindicative justice, when by Christs blood, Satan hell and death, all the enemies of Gods children are overcome; and this, saith he, is evidenced, because the Apostle mentioneth a *propitiation* and redemption through Christs blood, and this the Jews acknowledged by their sacrifices, who thought thereby they obtained mercy after justice was satisfied.

One thing more is to be added, that the Apostle useth three words of some affinity with one another: The first is δικαίωσις. that is once only, *Rom.* 5.18. translated Justification. The second is δικαίωμα. and that sometimes is taken for the

Laws

Laws and Commandments of God, *Luk.*1.6. sometimes for the constitution and appointment of God to punish, as *Rom.* 1.32. and sometimes for Justification, *Rom.*5.16. in a clean other sense then *Aristotle* useth it, who distinguisheth *Ethic. lib.*5. from δικαιοσύνη, and makes it to be the correcting and punishing of that which is unjust. The third word is δικαιοῦν here in the Text, and often in other places, applied sometimes to things, and sometimes to persons or actions, sometimes to God, and sometimes to man; whereas then we see Christ set forth to be *a propitiation for sinne*, for this end, *that God might declare his justice and righteousnes, his severity and anger against sinne*, Observe,

That Christ crucified is a demonstration of Gods justice and anger against sinne. You may not look only for full demonstrations of Gods grace and love, but also of his justice and anger. *Justified by his grace*, there is mercy; *through the blood of Christ*, there is justice. Now the limitation of the manifestation of Gods justice in the Text, *viz. to this time*, the time of the Gospel, is very observable; for we are apt to think the time of the Gospel only a time of demonstration of Gods grace; that God never revealed so much love as in these daies: and indeed this is true, therefore its called *the acceptable time, the time of salvation*, the spiritual Jubilee: But yet withall its a time wherein God demonstrateth his justice, that his hatred against sinne is so implacable, that only the blood of his dear Son can pacifie him. God manifested his anger against sinne in the destruction of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, as also in the drowning of the whole world; but Christ crucified on the cross may more evidence Gods fury and displeasure against sinne, then any of those judgements; yea the torments of damned persons in hell do not so visibly shew forth Gods irreconciliation with sinners, as Christs oblation of himself by way of an expiatory sacrifice for sinne. But that the truth of this doctrine may appear, its good to take notice of these Propositions. *Observ.*

First, *That all mankinde through* Adams *transgression, is wholly plunged in sinne, and thereby cursed by the Law, and obnoxious to all the wrath of God threatned in his word.* This the I.

Apostle layeth as a sure foundation, to evince Gods grace and justice in our Justification, *Rom.* 3.19. *That every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God:* This is a dreadfull doom that the Apostle passeth upon all: First, he applieth all those notorious transgressions which the Psalmist reckoneth up, *Their throat an open sepulchre, their feet swift to shed blood,* &c. to every one by nature; for though some only are actually so, yet seminally and habitually all are so; as young Serpents and Vipers are full of poyson, though they have not vented it. No man is born without this depravation. Then secondly, Hereby saith the Apostle mans *mouth is stopped.* The defect of his condemnation is so evident, so clear to his own conscience, that he cannot plead any thing; not a word to say, his judgement is so palpably just. Thirdly, *Every mans mouth is stopt,* None can plead the ingenuity and goodness of his nature: no *Jew,* no *Gentile,* no *Heathen,* though never hearing of Christ, can open his mouth for justification; how blame-worthy then are those Authors, who will open their mouths for the salvation of such! But this is not enough, for fourthly, We are all hereby become *guilty,* or subject to Gods judgement; Every man is a sentenced wretch to condemnation, every day, and every hour, yea moment this may surprize. *Paul* said he died daily, but every natural man may fear being damned daily. And lastly observe the universality, *All the world:* There is not any one born in a natural way of *Adam,* that is exempted. All the world is thus at the mercy of God; They have sinned, Hell is ready, Tophet is prepared, and justice is lifting up the arm to give that eternal blow, only God staieth his hand: There wants nothing but a command from God, and then all the curse of the Law, and devils of hell lay hold upon thee as their own: This is every mans case: So also *Gal.* 3.10. every one is pronounced *cursed, that continueth not in all things the Law requireth:* Now no man doth that, but the clean contrary, breaketh every command, and that all the day long, his thoughts being alwaies and only upon evil; therefore we are all in this cursed estate: The ground is cursed, the creatures are cursed, but none as man is cursed, whose condition

is

is worse then Toads or the vilest creatures that are; he had a thousand times better never to have been born, or to have been made a Serpent or Toad, then a Man, if never recovering from this natural state he is born in.

The second Proposition. *As man is thus plunged into all sinne, so the anger and wrath of God is accordingly upon him.* II. For though sinne may merit and justly deserve Gods wrath, yet some may think God will not take advantage, his mercy may be so great, that he will pass by all this relation: And thus indeed the *Socinians*, who deny *Christs Satisfaction, and so lay the ax to the root of all Christianity.* They say, notwithstanding mans sinne, yet God was never unreconciled with us, and that there is no such thing as justice in God, which necessarily requireth such a satisfaction; yea, they make this doctrine of Christs Satisfaction to Gods justice, to be horrible blasphemy: But what monstrous doctrines and blasphemies will not breed in mans heart, if not guided and assisted by God? for what is more clear in Scripture then Gods righteous anger and judgements against wicked men? *Ephes.* 1. *Are we not all the children of Gods wrath?* Is not God said to be *angry with the wicked all the day long?* Is not *the wrath of God* said *to abide upon him that beleeveth not?* So that such places do not only prove we are at enmity with God, but God also at enmity with us. Doth not the Scripture delight to call him *a consuming fire?* and that in respect of sinne? But (say the *Socinians*) God is said 2 *Cor.* 5. 13. to be *reconciling the world to himself*, and for that purpose the *Gospel* is the *ministry of reconciliation*; so that though we be enemies, and not reconciled to God, yet God is to us, he was never unreconciled with mankinde; but they forget one passage in the Text, *God was in Christ reconciling the world*; so that had it not been through Christ, the great gulf between God and man would have continued. Indeed God is said to be first the party though offended, to seek reconciliation, *partly* to demonstrate his love the more to us, though he need us not, though he is happy enough without us, though not he, but we have done the wrong, yet he offers reconciliation, and hereby man is made the more inexcusable; *partly* in allusion to the custom amongst

Why God first seeks to man to be reconciled.

amongst men, whom though the inferiour be bound to seek the face of his superiour whom he hath offended, yet he dareth not be so bold the distance is so great. But *Lastly*, the offer of reconciliation is attributed to God, because it is impossible for man abiding in his sinfull condition, but to persist in all frowardness and rebellion against God. As *David* first sought out a way for reconciliation with *Absolom*; thus also God doth, because we, if left to our selves, should live and die in an obstinate averseness to him. Besides, The Text only saith, *God is reconciling the world to himself*; now there is a great difference between God *reconciling* and *reconciled*: The former supposeth in God a propensity to bring about the way of reconciliation; not that he is already reconciled, but this floweth from a general love and pity he beareth to mankinde, whereby he procureth a way that actual reconciliation may be obtained between man and God; yea *Ephes.* 2. 16. compared with *Col.* 1. 20. there is inferred a reconciliation of *Jew* and *Gentile*, *Angels* and *Men* together, who by sinne were made enemies; and all this is in *uno tertio*, to God himself, which supposeth that there was not only enmity between one another, but also against God himself: Let this then be firmly concluded on, That *God is an angry enemy and a professed adversary unto every man abiding in his natural condition, and that therefore it belongs to his justice not to bear or suffer the contempt of his Majesty, but to be avenged on all, unless there be a way of satisfaction found out.*

III. Hence the third Proposition is, That *Christ voluntarily became man, and offered up himself as a sacrifice upon the cross to satisfie Gods justice and expiate our sinnes.*

The blasphemous errors of Socinians.

This is that the *Socinian* ear cannot endure, though this be the Christian treasury; therefore they hold Christ to be but *a meer man*, though a constituted and gifted *God* after his resurrection; and because a meer man, they deny by his death he satisfied God, but that he died as a Martyr to confirm the doctrine he preached, and to be an example unto us to walk in all patience and self-denial; and whereas they complain that we use the word Satisfaction in a fundamental point of Religion, which yet is not in Scripture: We answer, The thing

thing is there, though not the word; there is *redeeming*, laying down a *price*, becoming a *sacrifice* and *propitiation*, which is all one with *Satisfaction*; and they who will elude those words above mentioned, may they not, if the word *satisfaction* had been expresly mentioned evade also? would they not say, as they do about *redemption* and a *sacrifice*, that its only *metaphorical*? that the word is used sometimes when there is no *price* or *expiation* of the fault made, as in 2 *Sam.* 19.7. *Mark* 15.15. But that Christ by his death did pacifie the wrath of God, and make an atonement to Gods justice, may easily be believed, if we do seriously consider with our selves, *that it must be some weighty, urgent and important cause, that should make Christ to dye; and that so ignominiously.* Its such a wonderfull mystery that it may make us stand astonished, considering how dear Christ was to the Father, his *only begotten Son, his well-beloved Son, who was in the bosom of the Father*, yet God spareth not him, and that to *become a curse for us, to dye a cursed death with all shame and ignominy.* Who can think that all this should be to confirm doctrine only, for that Christ, did enough by his miracles and holy life? and besides all the blessed Martyrs that suffered for the truth, abundantly confirmed that: Shall we then think that God would put his only son to die in that unheard of manner, and for no more then the *Socinian* expresseth? Is here such infinite love and unspeakable riches of grace only for this? Is he called a *Saviour* and a *Mediator* for no other end? Who that hath reason can be thus perswaded? But if this do not convince, the Scripture arguments are so powerfull, that they will compel us, and its wonder to see how the *Socinians* place and displace, pervert and subvert every phrase, every word, yea every comma, that they may not be forced to believe that which they are resolved against. And

Christs death a satisfaction to Divine Justice. *Arg.* 1.

First, *All those places of Scripture where Christ is said to redeem, purchase, or buy us by his blood, do plainly demonstrate that a Satisfaction was given to God by Christs death.* The words are λυτρῶσ, ἀπολυτρῶσις, ἀπολυτρῶσθαι, ἀγοράζειν, &c. *Rom.* 3.24. *Tit.* 2.14. *Heb* 9.12. 1 *Cor.* 6.20. In all true and proper buying and redeeming, there is a *price* and a *satisfaction*, and thus the

Scripture speaks of Christs blood. Neither doth that weaken this Argument, to say, That to buy or redeem doth sometimes signifie to obtain a thing without any price; as, *Buy without money*, and the people of *Israel* are said to be *redeemed* out of *Egypt*, for none of those places have such circumstances to evince this meaning, as when it speaks of *Christs death*: the question is not, Whether the words may not be used metaphorically in some other place? but Whether it be in these texts or no? and we say, the Scripture useth these expressions constantly of Christs death, and why then should we depart from the literal meaning, unless we will turn all the Scripture into an Allegory? especially when its made an opposition to other kinde of buyings, as 1 *Pet.* 1.8. *You are not bought with gold and silver, but with the precious blood of Christ.*

Arg. 2. A second Argument is taken *from all those places of Scripture, where remission of our sinnes is attributed to Christs death as a cause, yea that he is said to die for us*, Heb. 9. 13. Rom. 3. 14. Now how could the forgiveness of our sinnes be attributed to Christs death, if he died only for an *example*; his blood is said to be *shed for the remission of sinnes*, yea that *without blood there is no remission of sinnes*. Christ then died not out of necessity of nature absolutely, as men do, but voluntarily; and to this death of his our pardon is attributed as a cause. Why? but because God would not forgive, had not there been such a cause procuring of it. Its not thy tears, nor all thy penal satisfactions Popery hath brought in, that could pay the least farthing, much less all the talents we owed to God. This Argument is the more strengthened if we take in all those places, where Christ is said *to die for us*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. *Matth.* 20. 28. where the prepositions are not only ὑπὲρ and περὶ for they may sometimes signifie the final cause, *viz.* for our good, but ἀντὶ, which doth alwaies signifie a compensation, or a substitution in the room of another thing: Thus *Matth.* 5. 30. *An eye* ἀντὶ *for an eye, a tooth* ἀντὶ *for a tooth*; neither are the adversaries ever yet able to shew that ἀντὶ doth not alwaies signifie in our stead and for us, so that Christ died for us. And this is that which doth so commend and glorifie

the

the love of Christ, that he should come and dye in our stead, that he should be made a curse in our room; that whereas Gods anger and fury was to fall upon us, he should interpose and say, Let all fall upon me. No wonder if the Scripture commend this to us, as a superlative, transcendent love: *Jonathans love to David* was not so much as a *drop* to this *Ocean*. All the prophane instances of men dying for others, or devoting themselves to death for the publique good, are but starres, or not so much, to this Sun; for here was not a meer corporal suffering, as some would have, Papists and *Pinchin* lately, but in his soul; strong conflicts he endured with Gods displeasure, crying out, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* When *Isaac* was to be sacrificed, God provided a Ram in his place; this was our condition, when we were to suffer eternal vengeance as the just reward of our sinnes, then Christ interposed, saying, *Behold I come to do thy will (O God.)* So that Christ did not only dye for our good, for so *Paul* suffered for the good of Gods Church, but in our stead and our room; That came upon him, which should have fallen upon us. Oh how should this indear Christ to us! Think, If when Christ was to dye, God the Father had spoken from heaven to thee, I appointed my Son indeed to dye, but come thou and be buffetted, spit upon, reproached and crucified in his room, come thou suffer agonies in his stead; Must thou not have been compelled to do this, as they did *Simon* to bear the Cross? Yet Christ did all this with willingness for thee.

SERM. VII.

More Demonstrations of the Satisfaction of Christs Death to Divine Justice; With Answers to the Socinian *Objections against it.*

ROM. 3. 26.

To declare (I say) at this time his Righteousness, &c.

I Shall mention one or two more Arguments, to prove, *That Christ died not only doctrinally, or exemplarily, but by way of atonement and expiation, so as to satisfie the justice of God, and appease his anger:* For as *David* in an evil cause, being possessed with rage, as soon as ever he heard *Uriah* was dead, began presently to be pacified: So the justice and anger of God being prepared to consume sinfull man, no sooner heareth of *Christ crucified*, but is accorded by an happy temperament through Christ with mercy. Therefore that Christs death was expiatory is manifested further,

Arg. 3. First, *By those places of Scripture, which speak of that happy exchange which God hath made for us, by imputing our sins to him, and his righteousnesse to us.* So that as God for our sins laid on him did break and wound him: Thus for his righteousnesse made ours, the Lord doth not onely forgive, but crown with everlasting glory.

Among

Among other places, there are these eminent Texts, *Isa.* 53.4,5,6,7. *&c.* which Chapter seemeth to be an History rather then a Prophecy of Christs sufferings. As for *Grotius* his opinion, That the man here spoken of in the Text, was *Jeremiah*, primarily and literally, though he acknowledgeth more sublimely Christ to be understood, *Annotat. in* Isa. *cap.* 4.53. we passe it by as a Jewish fable, though all along his Annotations he mentioneth not Christ, but endeavoureth to shew how *Jeremiah* did bear the Jews sins, how he was wounded for their transgression, and did bear their iniquities, *viz.* by his preaching and instruction: Even as the *Socinians* explain it of Christ. But to the diligent Reader all things are as plain, as if he did with his bodily eyes see *Christ crucified* on the Crosse, sweating bloud in his grievous agonies; Let us consider the Prophet thus ocularly demonstrating Christ wounded, and that not for any sinne he had done, but for our iniquities; and whereas the Prophet informs us of the judgement most men had to see him thus extraordinarily smitten by God, *viz.* that he was some grand Impostor and Deceiver, At the 4th *vers.* he saith, *Surely* (that is a word of confidence, and of causality) *he hath born our griefs, and carried our sorrows.* By griefs and sorrows are principally meant our sins, as 1 *Pet.* 2.25. Though *Matth.* 8.15. seemeth to apply it to bodily diseases, which the *Socinians* greedily catch at, saying, As Christ took away bodily diseases, not because he did bear them on his own body, he had no palsie, no lamenesse or blindenesse: so he takes away our sins, not by having them imputed to him, as a Surety in our stead, but by removing them, which they explain in several respects. But to that place of *Matthew*, among other answers there are two most probable. First, of those who think both sins and bodily diseases are properly and literally intended, and so *Peter* applieth it to one, and *Matthew* to another; but some learned men dislike this, because, say they, there cannot be two literal senses, or meanings of the same Text. And therefore in the second place, they say, by sorrows and griefs is directly and principally understood sins, but indirectly and by consequent bodily diseases, either because they come from

sin, or because our Saviour in curing of bodily diseases did principally look to sinne as the cause of them, and therefore told the healed person, *Her sins were forgiven her.* Thus Christ by taking our sins upon him, did thereby acquire a right and power to remove those punishments that follow sinne, and the Hebrew word *Sabal*, whatsoever may be said of *Nasa*, doth alwayes signifie *to bear* or *carry*, and not to *take away*: Oh then the unspeakable love of Christ in bearing our sins for us! This was more then to bear any outward calamity for us, for its sinne only that displeaseth God, and makes him offended. To this purpose is *vers.* 5. *The chastisement of our peace*, or *our pacifications was upon him, and by his stripes We are healed.* What can be more expresse then this? In him was no sinne found, but *our iniquities bruised* him, *wounded* him, *crucified* him; our sins were the *spears* that ranne into his side, we are all crucifiers of Christ, we may all say with *Judas*, We have not only betrayed, but even crucified the holy one: A sad meditation it should be to humblenesse: It followeth at *vers.* 6. *The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all*, he hath made to meet on him, as when many violent waters meet in one breach that is made, it hurrieth all away: Had not the Lord Christ been God as well as man, our iniquities would have carried him away like a torrent, he could not have stood in the gap to stop the wrath of God that was breaking out. Though these things were bitter to Christ, yet they cause unspeakable joy to the believer, for God will not require punishment for the same sins twice, he will not punish them in Christ, and in thee also: when justice shall make inquisition after thee, thou wilt be found in Christ, as the manslayer in the City of refuge. Here is an Altar from which justice may not take thee and destroy thee. As if the Prophet could not speak enough of this glorious mystery, he repeateth again *vers.* 10. *It pleased the Lord to bruise him*, to grinde him to dust, and although this was so terrible, yet *vers.* 12. *He poured out his soul to death*, which denoteth the free and spontaneous offering himself to all this misery.

A second Text which confirmeth this reciprocal imputation, is 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *He who knew no sinne became sinne for us, that*

that we might be made the righteousnesse of God in him. What can be clearer? This Text seemeth to be written in the Sunbeams, its so evident for our purpose. Christ though he had no sinne in himself, yet *became sinne*; if you take it but for a Sacrifice of sinne, it is enough; and indeed he could not be a Sacrifice for sinne, unlesse sinne was first laid upon him: And why is all this? We may say, That we who knew no righteousnesse, may become the righteousnesse of God in him; *Righteousnesse*, and the *righteousnesse of God*, but *in him.* Thus we are *Jacob* in our elder brothers cloathes, as *Ambrose* of old hinted, which *Calvin* further amplifying, so affected *Pighius* the Papist, that he came off from his inherent righteousnesse, to that imputed by Christ. Now truly, what the Prophet *Isaiah, Chap.*1. brake out into, *Hear, O Heavens, and hearken, O Earth!* in respect of that unnatural rebellion of the *Israelites*, we may, because of this wonderfull and unheard of love, its more then any sinfull man dareth pray or hope for: That Christ should become thus a Sacrifice for us, that he should be bound to loose us, guilty to free us; it should be received into our hearts, as such unspeakable love, that we should even with the Church swound and faint away in the ravishments of it. And yet there is

A third Text that goeth higher, *Gal.*3.13. *Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us.* What vassal could expect that his King should come and die an ignominious death that he may be set at liberty. Yet thus Christ did to us, and that his enemies, and rebels against him. This goodnesse of Christ is so transcendent, that we may justly conclude, Though one man had his heart full of as much love, as all the Angels and Saints collected together, yet he should cry out, I am straightned within, O my leanness, my leanness!

The last sort of Arguments may be taken *from those places of Scripture, which expresly call Christs dying a Sacrifice for our sins.* Now its the proper notion of a Sacrifice to expiate sinne, to reconcile God. Thus the Heathens, though they were guilty of horrible Idolatry, yet thus farre they had a

true

true impression upon their consciences, that something must be done to pacifie God. Hence the Scripture doth so often attribute ἱλασμὸν to Christ, 1 *John* 2.2. *Chap.* 4.10. and this ἱλάσκεσθαι is to expiate sinne, *Heb.*2.17. Now that Christ became a Sacrifice thus for our sins, ye heard *Isa.*53.10 and often in the New Testament, *Ephes.*5.2. where he is called not only προσφορὰ, but θυσία, which is alwayes applied to a bloudy Sacrifice. And the Apostle in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, especially *Chap.* 9.26. *Chap.* 10.12. doth at large prove his Priestly office from this oblation of himself a Sacrifice, whereas if this were done only doctrinally, as *Socinians* plead, he had no Priestly office at all. Now the Apostle sheweth all the *Legal Sacrifices* were only *types* of *Christ*. That it was not *their bloud that could expiate sinne*, but it must be *Christs*, neither will the *Socinians* exception avail, that onely the solemn *anniversary Sacrifice* for all the people, was only a *type of Christ* (though that indeed was more illustrious, and if granted is enough to confute their *heresie*) for all their *private Sacrifices* were likewise a *type of Christ*; and therefore 1 *Cor.*5. *Christ* is called our *Passeover*, and *John* Baptist said, *Behold the Lamb that taketh away the sin of the world*: So that *Christ* being *typified* both in the *publick Sacrifice* and *private*, doth notably teach us, that we are not only in the general to look upon *Christs* death as *expiatory* of the sins of all the *elect*, but every godly man in particular is to appropriate the benefit of this Sacrifice unto himself.

Above all Sacrifices in the Law, that of the *Scape-goat* did palpably demonstrate *Christ*, for then the people in a solemn manner laid their hands on the *Goat*, thereby signifying, that as he was to perish, so they; only he was in their stead, and thus when their sins were laid on him, he was turned into the vast wilderness, where they could never hear of him more. Though he was not killed, yet hereby he was exposed to death, and this did signifie that the sins of the godly being laid upon Christ, he bore them away even clear out of sight, so that they should never be charged upon the godly. Let then the godly soul believing say, Oh the depth, the breadth and height of this love of Christ being thus an expiatory Sacrifice

Sacrifice for our sins: You see this Article founded upon Scripture so firmly, that heaven and earth must sooner passe away then this truth: &of them that would take this away from us, say, as *Solomon* of *Adonijahs* petition, *This is to ask the kingdom also*; This is to take away all Religion, heaven and all happinesse from us. For it is in this Sacrifice, which is called *a sweet savour to God*, that he receiveth us: nothing from us can come but unsavoury and abominable, its in Christ onely we are accepted: As in a pure glass we may see loathsom and noisom carrion, but in the glasses representation of it, all the filthinesse is taken away. As that Emperour, who in a precious jewel of a great quantity made like a glass, would behold through that, all horrid and deformed objects, which through that representation were made delightsom and acceptable. Thus in a well understood sense all the filth, the drosse, the noisomnesse that is in our most holy duties being represented in Christ, hath their filthinesse done away: So that though not for our sakes, yet for Christs sake, God will become reconciled with us; if thou to some unworthy man begging of thee in Christs name, doest relieve him saying, Its not for thy sake, but for Christs I do it; think God doth so to thee, its not for any worth in thy duties, in thy obedience, but for Christs sake.

That this Doctrine may the more clearly be apprehended, I shall adde further Propositions, the last running into many particulars.

The fourth Proposition is, *That God in Christ crucified, with the benefits accrewing thereby doth at the same time demonstrate both mercy and justice, grace and righteousnesse. We are justified freely by his grace,* δωρεὰν, there was no antecedent cause, or right in us to justification, and that by the bloud of Christ, as appeasing Gods wrath. So then, let not those many places of Scripture, which testifie God forgiveth freely, and for his own name sake, make you doubt of Christs satisfaction, saying with the *Socinians*, *How can it be freely, and yet with satisfaction?* Is the love or mercy of a Creditor to be commended for releasing the debt of a debtor, if another hath paid the full summe to him, where is the Creditors IV. *Obj.*

How Justification and Salvation are of love and grace, notwithstanding Christs satisfaction.

kindeneſſe here? But to this its fully anſwered, That when the mercy and grace of God is commended in the Scripture, *Its not with reſpect to Gods juſtice, or oppoſition to that*, as if a full price were not laid down, *but to our works and righteouſneſſe*. In all thoſe places where *Paul* doth mention the grace of God that we are juſtified and ſaved by his grace: The immediate oppoſition, is not Gods juſtice, but *Not of our ſelves, not by the works that we have done*. Our Juſtification then is of pure meer grace in reſpect of us, but in reſpect of Chriſt it is of merit, it is of juſtice. Although therefore the juſtice of God be ſatisfied by Chriſts bloud, and ſo ſpiritual benefits are vouchſafed to us, yet all is of grace and meer love to us, and that in theſe particulars.

Firſt, *It was Gods infinite love to his, that made him finde out a way, and procure a Mediator for us*. And thus the Scripture attributeth it to Gods love, that he ſent his only Sonne into the world to die for us; God might have left us in our undone eſtate, as he did the Angels, but he pitied us, and ſent his Son to become a Sacrifice for us.

Secondly, *Its the meer grace and love of God not only to procure a Mediator, but to accept of him in our ſtead*. For though Chriſts ſatisfaction was infinite, and could not be rejected by the Father as inſufficient; for there was no defect in that, yet God was not rigidly bound in juſtice to accept of a Surety for us. But as God threatned, *The day thou eateſt thereof thou ſhalt die*; and as the Rule is often mentioned in the Scripture, *The ſoul that ſinneth, that ſhall die*; So might God have required this ſatisfaction in our perſons, that we in our own perſons muſt anſwer his juſtice, but yet ſuch was his love and grace, that he admitted a Surety in our room, not *abrogating* his Law, but *relaxing* of it, as is to be more fully ſhewed.

Thirdly, *It is yet further of grace, becauſe we in this work of reconciliation bring nothing of our own, we were in the ſtate of enemies and adverſaries*. So that every thing proclaimeth grace to us.

And fourthly, *Its of grace, in reſpect of the application of this ſatisfaction and merit to our ſouls*; For how many, though Chriſt thus offered up himſelf, are yet damned, though

Chriſt

Christ was crucified, yet most will eternally perish; and why is all this? but because most refuse the benefits of this Mediator, and so make themselves unworthy of his love, so that if any partake of these glorious benefits, it is because God doth make them differ from others. Its he that by his grace doth open their eyes, and change their hearts, whereby they hunger and thirst after this Redeemer. If therefore though Christ came into the world, yet his death may be in vain to thee, if thou through thy obstinacy mayest get no more good by Christ crucified, then the devils; then certainly such who are inabled and fitted to make use of Christ, they must acknowledge all is of grace to them.

Hence the fifth Proposition, *That there is a difference between mans forgiving another, and Gods forgiving us.* Indeed we pray, that God would *forgive us as we forgive them that trespasse against us.* And to this purpose our Saviour brings in a Parable, shewing how we ought to forgive others, if we expect God should forgive us. But in this comparison, we must distinguish between mercy, and the manner of mercy. *We are to be mercifull as God is,* but in the manner God takes one way, and we another. This is evident, because we are commanded *to forgive our enemies* abiding enemies, and although they refuse and reject our love; Whereas the *Socinians* confesse, That it would not stand with the honour of God to forgive all mens sins, even of such who wilfully continue impenitent and obstinate. Again, Man is a private person, and the offended party, and so being bound by the Law of a Superiour, it is his duty sometimes to forgive without satisfaction (though in some cases he cannot) but God doth not forgive meerly as offended, nor is he to be considered as a private person, but as the publick *Judge* and *Governor* of the world, who is thereby ingaged to *judge righteously, and to render to every one according to his works:* So that there is a vast difference between *pecuniary debts and criminal,* as you shall hear afterwards. V.

The sixth Proposition, *Christ dying doth not thereby hinder the endeavour after, and exercising of our selves in all holy works.* For thus the Adversaries urge. VI.

Object. The Doctrine of Christs satisfaction sets open a wide door to all impiety (say they) if Christ hath paid the debt and satisfied the Law, then we are not bound to pay it, and so we may live as we list.

But first we see, even the Apostles themselves could not preach the grace of God, but they had this poison suckt from the sweet herbs they planted, *Rom.6.1. Christ and his benefits do not oppose holiness, but do necessarily inferre it*; for Christs death is not only for remission of sin, but *to redeem us a peculiar people unto himself, zealous of good works.* There is not only a *moral connexion* between Christs death and an holy life, *viz.* That a man by beholding Christs love should be moved to love him again; but there is a *causal connexion*, even as between the Sun & the Sun-beams, between fire and heat: where the benefit of Christs death is, there is also his Spirit sanctifying and leading into every good way. Indeed the true and proper answer is, That seeing Christ satisfied God, by his death and his obedience. *Therefore our obedience and sufferings are not required for that end, his was*; we are not by our godlinesse to think of a compensation to God, ours cannot stand in his presence if God enter into judgement; our tears for sinne are not to the same end his bloud was. But though holinesse and patience be not required of us to that end, for which it was in Christ, yet there are many other great and necessary reasons of it in the Scripture: And as for the *Socinian* this objection may be more strongly retorted on him, seeing he holds such a mercy and grace as forgiveth sinne freely without any satisfaction that God is reconciled with all men; *That there is no such attribute of justice in God*, whereby he is inclined to punish sin. These notions must needs encourage in all impiety and wickednesse.

VII. The seventh Proposition, *In this satisfaction and redemption of ours, the price was truly paid to God.* It was God who accepted of the Sacrifice laid down for our sins. This is to be observed, because the enemies of this truth ask,

Object. If we were bought, who received the price? The *Scripture* saith, we were *captives to the devil*, and *We are redeemed from our vain conversation.* Therefore if a price be paid

paid, its paid to the devil and our vain converſation, and how abſurd is that to ſay?

Anſw. But the anſwer is, In our Captivity we are to conſider the *principal* that detaineth us, and the *inſtrumental*. The *principal* is *Gods Juſtice*, and his wrath, we are priſoners in the firſt place to that, but then the *devil* and *ſinne* as its a puniſhment, are the under *Jaylors*, the ſerjeants to Gods wrath; and its not abſurd to be redeemed from them, as the inſtruments of Gods vengeance. Neither is that ſuch an abſurdity as the *Socinians* urge, that then God muſt ſatisfie himſelf, which is (ſay they) as if a man ſhould give money out of his purſe to another, to bid him ſatisfie him; for the caſe of a *pecuniary debt*, and a *crime* are not alike, as the famous inſtance of *Zaleucus* witneſſeth, who when a Law was made for the putting out of the eyes of an *adulterer*, and his own ſonne, being found in that crime, he found an excellent temperament to ſatisfie the Law, by ſuffering one of his own eyes, and another of his ſons to be put out. Beſides in this work of redemption we are to acknowledge the peculiar order, and appropriated works of the *Trinity*, which the *Socinians* blaſpheming, no wonder they ſplit themſelves at this rock, ſo that the ſatisfaction was common to all the *three perſons*, being *God*, *Chriſt* the ſecond perſon, and the *Spirit of God* the third perſon required ſatisfaction as well as the Father, for they have one eſſential will, and juſtice; only the execution of this ſatisfaction, was by that wiſe temperament of ſending the ſecond perſon to become man, and die for our ſakes.

In theſe things therefore there is infinite occaſion to draw out our Faith and our Love, whether the truth or the goodneſſe be more wonderfull, its hard to ſay. Oh the depths of the counſels of God, may faith ſay! And oh the depths and goodneſſe of God, may love ſay! If it were only an object to be believed, here was enough to take up the whole man, but being alſo an object to be loved and imbraced, How wide muſt our hearts be to receive ſuch things? The truth of them is above thy underſtanding, and the goodneſſe of them above thy heart. This Ocean cannot be received into thy little ſhell, they cannot enter into thy heart, do thou therefore enter

into them; be swallowed up in the faith and love of these things; and certainly *Paul* was so, when he desired to know nothing but Christ crucified; and when he said, he no longer lived, but Christ in him. Oh remember there are more glorious things to possess thy heart, then earthly vanities: This *Sanctum Sanctorum* is not to entertain every unclean thing. This precious Cabinet is only for Jewels, and not dung.

SERM. VIII.

More Propositions about the Sufferings of Christ for Sinne: Their usefulness, sufficiency, and extent; with Answers to more Objections of the Socinians.

ROM. 3. 26.

To declare (I say) his Righteousness, that he may be Just, and the Justifier of him that beleeveth in Jesus.

THere remain further Propositions to clear this fundamental Doctrine, That the Righteousness of God is declared by Christs blood shed for the Remission of sin.

VIII. As first, *Christs blood was not useless, though God so loved the world, that he gave his only Son to dye for us.* For thus some urge, What necessity was there to satisfie Gods justice through Christ, seeing of his meer love he gave us Christ? if

Obj.

there-

therefore without any wrong to his justice, he could so love us as to give his only begotten Son, Why could not the same love pardon sinne, and give salvation without any injury unto his justice?

Answ. This Proposition therefore is to shew that there is a great difference between that love to mankinde by which he sent his Son into the world, and that more special and peculiar love, whereby he doth vouchsafe to some all saving priviledges. Its true, God without any breach of his justice did pity mankinde, and finde out a way for their pardon, but actually to pardon and save, that could not be without satisfaction, at least supposing the Decree of God, and his revealed will thus to punish sinne, and the reason of the difference between these two kindes of love is from the nature of them, one is a *general* love, as some call it a love of beneficence, whereby we are propense to do good, when a fit or lawfull way is found out: The other is a *particular special* love, and as some call it, a love of *complacency* and *delight*: now this cannot be in God towards a sinner, till his sinne which is so loathsom and abominable, be removed: We see the like case amongst men, A Judge who seeth a malefactor condemned by the Law, may for some just and powerfull reasons exceedingly pity the malefactor, and may think of all such waies whereby the Law may be satisfied, that so the condemned person may be released; yet actually he cannot set him at liberty, unless he will be unjust, till the Law be satisfied. Thus the Scripture commends in God a *Philanthropy*, a love to mankinde, willing their good; but this cannot be actually performed till the *justice of God be satisfied*. He is mercifull, but he is also just and righteous, and therefore will shew his hatred and displeasure against sinne.

IX. The second Proposition. *Christs death, although the benefit of it doth not extend to all, yet was in it self a sufficient price and satisfaction to God.* So that his righteousnes is herein manifested, though all be not saved. I shall not enter into that dispute, Whether Christs death was intentionally a price for all? or Whether considered in it self only, it be sufficient, though not efficacious for all? This is now to be asserted,

That

That though such a price was laid down sufficiently for all, yet God is not unrighteous, if all be not redeemed, neither may we think that men are unjustly damned, because a price is paid for them, for we must distinguish between the *purchase* or *satisfaction* it self, and the application of this, for though Christs satisfaction depend not on our faith, its not our beleeving that makes it a *satisfaction to God*; this it hath from its own inherent worth: yet that this *satisfaction* may be applied to us, and so become advantagious, there is faith required. Not that faith doth make Christs death effectual unto us, as if the benefit of that were suspended upon our beleeving, and our beleeving upon the uncertain use of our free will, for thus Christ might have died, and no man be saved; no more good might have come to men then the Apostate Angels, but that Christ by his death purchased such benefits for those that should believe and receive him; yea and this very believing and receiving of him is also a fruit of his death, so that Christs death though it be an absolute price unto God and depends not on the condition of our frail strength, yet it doth not oppose such an order of means, in the use whereof he only will communicate the priviledges he purchased, so that if men do wilfully reject this price, they become guilty of their own damnation; as in the year of Jubilee, if a servant would not accept of the liberty offered, he was then to be a perpetual bonds man, and to have his ear boared as a sign thereof. Thus if thou wilt reject Christ profering thee liberty from sinne and hell, and that at so dear a rate, thou deservest to have thy ear boared, and to live and die Satans slave. When *Cyrus* proclaimed a liberty of returning for every *Jew* into his own Country, if any loved *Babylon* better then *Canaan*, and so would not take the benefit profered, the fault lay upon the man himself, whose will was thus corrupted. Thus it is with the price Christ hath paid, many do not apply the benefit of it, because they are corrupted in their hearts, and love their empty husks, better then the fatted calf in their fathers house: God therefore accepted of the price, yet so that the application of it is to be in the way and order God hath appointed, so that the damned

in

in hell are not punished unjustly, as if God required satisfaction twice, once of Christ, and then in their own persons.

The third Proposition. *Gods justice is satisfied, although Christ did not indure the eternal torments of death.* X. For it was impossible for him who was to be our Mediator, that he should be alwaies detained in his sufferings, and not be at last a Conquerour. Though therefore it be objected against Christs satisfaction, That he did not suffer the everlasting torments of hell, and therefore it could not be a sufficient price to Gods justice; Yet it is answered that Christs sufferings in his soul and body were *equivalent* to it: Although to to speak properly, eternity is not of the essence of death, which is the reward of sinne, and threatned by God, but its accidental, because man thus dying is never able to satisfie God; therefore seeing he cannot pay the last farthing, he is for ever kept in prison. As eternal death hath in it *eternity* and *despair*, necessarily in all those that so die, so Christ could not suffer; but what was wanting in duration, was supplied partly by the immensity of his sorrows, conflicting with the sense of Gods wrath because of our sinnes imputed to him, so that he suffered more grief then if the sorrows of all men were put together; and partly by the dignity and worth of him who did suffer. Therefore the Scripture cals it *the blood of God*, *Act.* 20. 21. Indeed this is not only rejected by *Socinians*, but others also have denied the sufferings of Christ in his soul through Gods displeasure for our sinnes imputed unto him, adding many other new doctrines, especially one of late, *Pinchin* in his Book called *The meritorious price*, &c. But all those new assertions, blaming the common opinion as an universal error, are fitly to be examined, when we consider, What is that righteousnes which is imputed to us: for he makes neither the active or passive obedience imputed to us, though he grant Christ by a Mediatorial oblation of his body on the Cross to have satisfied the wrath of God. Therefore we shall defer the consideration of his Notion till that time, and in the mean while take it for granted, that *Isa.* 53. 4, 5, 6. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Gal.* 4. 13. do prove that God laid our

sinnes on him, that he bore them by imputation, that he conflicted in his agonies with the wrath of God, though without any sinne: So that although Christ did not suffer the sinfulnes and the perpetuity of those hellish torments, yet he did equivalently satisfie the wrath of God, and recompence them some other way. And for the better understanding of this, we are to know (as hereafter is to be more largely confirmed) that *Christ* in some respects did, or suffered the *idem*, the very same that we should have done; in other respects *tantundem*, or that which is *equivalent*: As for example, It was necessary that Christ should suffer death, and the same kinde of death, *viz.* a cursed death for us. Therefore that position, though used in antiquity, That one drop of Christs blood was sufficient to redeem the whole world: Yea some Jesuites say, *Nevinber de adoratione*, that one drop of sweat, or the least prair of Christ, was enough to have saved a thousand worlds, because his person was so infinitely worthy, is not to be admitted: for his infinite worth is not all, Gods justice required death, and a cursed death, therefore the same; not a drop of blood, but death it self must be. But then in respect of some *accidents* to this death, as the *eternity* of it, or for the suffering of *every kinde of pain* that is the fruit of sinne, then an equivalent suffering was enough, it was not required he should suffer every kinde of curse which is the effect of sinne, but in the general a cursed death: And thus also it is in the fulfilling of the Law for us, it was not necessary that he should perform every holy duty, for he could not perform the obedience which Magistrates or Married persons are bound to do; its enough that there was a fulfilling of it in the general for us, for this was equivalent to every kinde of particular obedience, as his sufferings were to every kinde of suffering. Though therefore Christ did not suffer eternal death for sinners, yet he suffered that which was equivalent, and therefore the justice of God is by his death wholly appeased.

XI. The fourth Proposition. *Though Christ the second person did thus voluntarily become a sacrifice for us, yet we are not to make such absurd conclusions as the Socinians do, That there-*

fore

fore we are beholding to one Person more then the other. By this doctrine (say they) we are more bound to the Son then to the Father, and so are to love one more then another. Thus corrupt reason would make a dissention, where the Scripture affirmeth unspeakable agreement, for the work of reconciliation is to be attributed to the whole Trinity, as satisfaction was given to it, because they have an essential will and justice; only the fulfilling of this was by the second Person, and the assumption of our nature, though it was terminated in the Son, yet the counsel and appointment of it was from the whole Trinity; which the *Ancients* declared by a similitude of three sisters putting on a coat upon one of them; though no similitude can illustrate this, because of the infinite distance between the *Creator* and the *creature*; and indeed the Scripture doth in a very high manner commend both the love of the Father and the Son, in the Sonnes becoming an expiatory sacrifice for us: The Fathers love is declared in sending his only Sonne in the world, that which was dearer to him then many thousand worlds, and whose good was to be preferred above all mankinde; yet God sends him into the world, and upon this work, to die an ignominious death for us; and as God did thus send his Son into the world, so he did also lay this command upon him *to dye for his sheep.* Therefore *John* 14.10. he did as he received *command of the Father.* And by the Psalmist he declared *to come and do the will of God, it was written in his heart.* So that it was the Fathers will he should be *thus bruised for our sinnes:* yea he saith, *Therefore the Father loveth him, because he layeth down his life for his sheep, John* 10.17. Thus you see the Fathers infinite love manifested, and then the *Sons* love, that is unquestionable, seeing he was so ready and willing to lay aside the manifestation of his glory, and to become in the repute of the worst of men for our sakes. Let us not then prophanely cavil at this glorious mystery, but adore the love of the Father and the Son, in their mutual agreement for this our redemption. Had the Father been against it, then Christs sufferings would not have been accepted: Had the Son refused it, then still our condition had been desperate without a Mediator. But oh the depths

of Gods wisdom and love in finding out this way for our peace and comfort.

XII. The fifth Proposition. *Although Gods justice be declared by Christs death, yet we cannot inferre thence, that therefore Christs death was only in respect of God, and not in reference to us.* For thus the adversaries argue, If Christ died to satisfie Gods justice, then this work which is so commended in the Scripture as an instance of love and grace to us, would not relate to us, but mainly to God, that he might be satisfied: But the inclusion of one end, doth not exclude the other, yea it necessarily inferreth it; for the chief and ultimate end of Christs death is the glorifying of God, but then there are other particular ends, as the satisfying of Gods justice, and by that all those inestimable benefits of Justification, Adoption and Salvation, which are attributed to Christs death likewise as the effects of it; so that because he died to appease the wrath of God, therefore he also died for our good: Hence is our reconciliation and peace with God made the fruit of his death: our sinnes provoked justice, and justice made a great gulf between Gods mercy and us, but Christ by his death removed all these divisions away.

XIII. The last Proposition. *Let it not seem strange that God thus required satisfaction ere he would pardon sinne, when yet man may and is commanded to forgive freely.* This hath been the occasion of shipwrack to many, they judge of Gods remission of sinnes, after the manner of men forgiving one another, but here is a vast difference:

For first, The disputing of Gods absolute power, whether he can forgive without remission, is not here controverted: Its plain by the Scripture that he will not: so that seeing God will not accept of us without satisfaction, it behoveth us to conclude, that this is the wisest way and most honouring of God, seeing God doth all things for his glory.

And yet secondly, Even humane reason cannot but apprehend many dissimilitudes between a private mans forgiving another his trespass, and Gods forgiving us: as thus, Man is by God commanded to forgive his brother, not only humbling himself, but if he do not seek reconciliation: Hence is

that

that command of *requiting evil with good*, of blessing those that curse us: But now the adversaries themselves dare not but say, it would be a great dishonour, and unbeseeming the holy God, to forgive all sinne whether men repent or no: Who can apprehend that though wicked men do with all malice and obstinacy, blaspheme and reproach God, that his pure eyes can without wrath behold all this? Its certain the Scripture represents God *a consuming fire* to such: that speaks of no mercy or favour, but the contrary, all wrath and vengeance to such as go on so wickedly.

Again, Even amongst men there are some trespasses that a man is not bound to forgive without satisfaction, neither can the party offended release the wrong, without sinne; as if a man murder another mans wife or childe, it is not in the mans power to release it, but he is bound to prosecute the revenge of it: and thus many cases may be given, wherein its not in a mans power to release his right, especially when it relateth to another, or when the Law of a superiour obligeth him, or the good of the publique doth require it: And although God have no superiour, and so cannot be bound by a Law above him, yet he is a Law to himself, so that he cannot but do wisely and righteously in all his waies.

Lastly, We are alwaies to distinguish between *private* men and *publique* persons; as also *pecuniary* debts, and *criminal* offences: It is true, a private man may remit a debt to his debtor, he is not bound to take any satisfaction; but a Judge in criminal causes, cannot without injustice forgive them. Now all sinne is committed against God as a publique person, as the Judge of the world; every sinne tends to the destruction of the universe: if it be let go unpunished, then all men will rejoyce in their wickedness, and think God is like one of them, as the Psalmist saith. If therefore Justice be so much commended to Magistrates for particular Societies, how much is it required to the whole Universe? The body can no more be compact without nerves and sinews, then the world without righteousnes from God. Thus you have heard several Propositions, which, if throughly understood, will confirm us against all those cavils which corrupt reason doth invent; for

its from that bitter fountain that all bitter streams do flow; whereas the understanding is to be captivated to the Word of God, we captivate Gods Word to our understanding: and as *Tertullian* in another case, *Deus non erit Deus nisi homini placuerit.* Having been thus large in the Doctrinal part, which was a shining light, let us be proportionable in the practical, that it may be also burning.

Use 1. And first, Doth *God* thus demonstrate his justice and severity against *sinne*, by Christs death? then let us take heed of love and delight in it: Why should that be pleasing to thee which filled Christ with so much bitterness? He was *a man of sorrows*, and wilt thou be a man of jollities? Was it a light matter that made him *sweat drops of blood?* Was it for nothing that he *cried out, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Oh say of all sinne which thou hast greedily desired, as *David* of the water of *Bethlehem* he so longed for, That *is was the blood of men*, he would not meddle with it; but do thou say, *This is the blood of Christ*, the price even of Christs blood, and how then shall I pollute my self with sinne?

How we should aggravate our sins by Christs death.

Now the aggravation of sinne by Christs death, doth appear, 1. First, *In the infinite evil of it*, that it carrieth such guilt with it, that nothing could satisfie God but an infinite price; and this is true not only of gross enormous sinnes, but also of the least sinnes: If all mankinde were but guilty of one sinne, and that the least thought which passeth away, yet there could not be any atonement made for it, but by Christs blood. Oh how should this make us tremble even at every idle word, idle thought! Oh say, This sinne cannot be accounted little, which is against so great a God, and needs such an infinite price! Let not then the customarinesse and universality of sinne make thee despise it; or do not say, This is but little, there needs not such ado; for the least sin thou art guilty of, can have no other atonement but by the blood of Christ. Little sins and great sinnes agree in this, they need a great Ransom.

2. 2. The aggravation of sinne appeareth, if we consider *what Christ was who came to destroy it.* All the wonderfull works that ever God did, the Creation of the world, and the preservation

servation of it, are nothing to this, that God should become man, and dye such a cursed ignominious death for us: In this mystery the Wisdom, Mercy, Justice and Power of God are made illustrious; now why was this? Shall we think the Father was unnatural and cruel to his Son to deliver him up to such torments for a matter of no moment? No certainly. This should make us stand astonished at the depth, length, and breadth of our sinfulness, that such an unheard of remedy must be provided for us! Oh cry out, My soul is too narrow, my thoughts are too streightned! I may think and think, but never can think according to the nature of sinne. The remedy provided makes me see the desperateness of the malady.

3. This also may aggravate it, that though a man do truly and bitterly humble himself for his sinnes, and acknowledge his rebellion, yet for all that, God will not pardon, without satisfaction by Christs blood: So that its not our tears, our prayers, our rendings of heart are able to expiate our iniquities, but it must be a work of infinite dignity to do this. *God will have Christs blood and our tears also, but not for the same purpose.* Therefore the *Papists* obscure this doctrine of Christs satisfaction, by adding their own. This is to divide the Mediatory Office between Christ and man; neither can all their distinctions deliver them. Let us then be an Evangelical people, who fly to Christ only; mourn, pray and humble our selves we do, but its Christs blood only that can wash us clean. Let our eyes and hearts be fixed on him. 3.

SERM.

SERM. IX.

Our Justification by Christ a Demonstration not onely of Gods Mercy, but Righteousness also. Or an instance of that Justice in God, whereby he will punish sinne. Also a Discussion of the proper Nature of Merit and Satisfaction, shewing that Christs Sufferings had all the Requisites to Satisfaction.

ROM. 3. 26.

To declare his Righteousness, that he might be just, &c.

WE have at large considered the final cause of our Justification through Christs bloud, as it is laid down by the Apostle in the *general*. We now come to the *distribution* he makes of this final cause, which is

1. The *finis cujus*, for what sake he thus *justifieth*, and that is, *that he may be just*.

2. The *finis cui*, for whose sake and good this is, and that is,

is, *That he might justifie him who believeth in Jesus.* We are to treat on the *finis cujus, That he might be just,* δίκαιος. This word (as the former δικαιοσύνη) doth sometimes signifie a mercifull one, sometimes one that is true, and sometimes one that is righteous in his works. Therefore there are interpreters, who as they understood the former word of Gods goodnesse and mercy, so they do this also: And indeed it cannot be denied, but that righteousnesse doth many times signifie mercy; because as *Dieu* observeth *in loc.* all the just and righteous acts of God in overcoming the Churches enemies, are a mercy to the Church. Christs conquering the devil and sinne by his bloud, hereby brought unspeakable mercies to his people; but the former reasons do convince, *That just is to be here taken strictly, for that property whereby he is propense to punish sinne*; and this is declared in that he will not justifie a believer without an *atonement* or *satisfaction through Christs bloud,* and thus you have heard the word is used many times; and I shall adde one pregnant place more, because this is so vehemently opposed by *Socinians,* Rom. 2. 5. where the *day of Judgement,* called also the day of wrath, is there said to have *the revelation of Gods righteous Judgement*; Why righteous? but because he will punish those hardned sinners in the Text with his eternal wrath; hence δικὴ is often for vengeance, *Jud.* 7. 2 *Thess.* 1. 9. yet we will not limit this justice to his *vindicative righteousnesse* onely, but to the righteousnesse of his words also.

Observ. * *That God in Justification of a believer is not only gracious and merciful, but just also.* Not in the same respects, but gracious in respect of us, and just in respect of the meritorious cause of it. *I am to treat of the righteousnesse of God, demonstrated therein,* and that is discovered in these particulars, The righteousnesse of his words, and the righteousnesse of his works.

The righteousnesse of Gods word in our Justification by Christ is seen,

The righteousnesse of Gods word concerning our Justification by Christ is seen,

First, *By all those predictions and promises which were made for Christs coming into the flesh, and becoming both a Priest and King of peace for us.* This was so notably spoken of, that all

the Jews were in expectation of them, though many of them carnally thought of a temporal Saviour otherwise: The Scripture saith, That both *Moses and the Prophets testified of him*, *Act.* 28. 23. Its an unsound opinion, though some of the Ancients were taken with it, That the Fathers in the Old Testament by their holinesse did *merit* the Incarnation of Christ; for this is attributed wholly to the love of God; and certainly if Christs humane Nature did not merit its hypostatical Union, much lesse could the believers of old, merit Christs coming into the world; Great are the predictions, and precious are the promises of a Christ in the Old Testament: Therefore the Prophets when the people were in any outward calamities, did then comfort them with the coming of a *Messiah*, as *Esay* 9. and *Micah* 5. partly hereby to assure them, that even their temporal power should not be totally destroyed till *Shiloh* came; and partly to teach the believers in all their publick straights, that though they had no outward peace, yet there was a spiritual peace procured with God through Christ; and therefore they were to rejoyce in Christ, when they had no earthly comfort to be glad of. Thus God shewed the truth of his promises, when in the fulnesse of time Christ came. Not as if Christ had not any Subsistence before he was incarnated, as the *Socinians* blaspheme: for 1 *Cor.* 10. 4. the *Israelites* in the wildernesse are said *to tempt Christ*; And *Heb.* 11. 26. *Moses* in his dayes is said *to esteem the reproaches of Christ above the treasures of Ægypt*; And 1 *Pet.* 1. 11. The Spirit which was in those Prophets of old, is called *the Spirit of Christ*. Christ then was in respect of his Divine Nature before his Incarnation, and all the godly in the Old Testament had benefit by him as well as in the New, for God had respect to that oblation which Christ was to offer in time.

II. Secondly, *Gods righteousnesse of truth in respect of his words, was also manifested in our Justification by Christs death.* For *Genes.* 3. God made this threatning to *Adam*, *In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die.* This sentence was passed from Gods own mouth, its irrevocable: So that whatsoever might

be said in respect of Gods absolute power to do otherwise, yet hypothetically supposing this commination, it would be unjust if death should not be required for sinne. Its true there is a difference between a Threatning and a Promise. In a Promise, God doth, as it were, become a debtor to man, he giveth a man so qualified right to claim such a priviledge of him, though in respect that by this Promise man is not alienated, or the thing promised from his dominion, he is not properly a debtor to man, for that is impossible, but to himself, he cannot be unfaithfull to himself, yet we acknowledge this fulfilling of his promise is attributed not onely to love or faithfulnesse, but righteousnesse also, 2 *Thess.* 1.6. 1 *John* 1.9. But in a threatning we cannot say properly that the delinquent hath a right to be punished, though he doth deserve it, or that God becomes in any respect a debtor to the sinner to punish him, yet in regard God is truth it self and immutable, no *iota* or *tittle* of any threatning shall fall to the ground: Let not the wicked man dream of such a mercy as shall infringe Gods truth; let him not fancy such a pardon, as doth contravene any threatning; Seeing therefore God hath peremptorily set down such a Law, that upon sinne there must be death, and this must stand, though heaven and earth should fall, it was altogether becoming the Justice of God, that if the sinner himself did not die, yet there must be one in his stead, that so the Law may be satisfied.

But then here is the grand Objection, *If Gods Justice be required for the fulfilling of that Law, how can that be, seeing the sinner himself doth not die, but an innocent one in his room,* the just for the unjust, 1 *Pet.* 3.18? which is tragically aggravated by the *Socinians*, as if the Orthodox attributed unheard of cruelty and injustice to God; And indeed thus farre the Doubt seemeth to have a specious ground, How is Gods righteousnesse seen in the fulfilling of this threatning? Or how is this threatning made good, seeing the person threatned, *If thou eat thou shalt die?* And as in the Hebrew, *Dying thou shalt die*, viz. *certainly* and *infallibly*, *did not*, or *doth not die*; but an innocent one, who *Obj.*

knew no sinne, is substituted in his room.

Answ. But this is easily answered, *Though the strict letter of the threatning required the sinner himself to die, yet it did not exclude, or forbid a Surety to come between.* God indeed said, the sinner shall die, but not he in his own person onely: So that though another should offer himself in his room, yet I will not accept of him; if God had done this, he had not onely shut man out of the terrestrial Paradise, but from all hopes also of the heavenly one, he had made their condition like that of the devils, and every man begging for pardon, would have had no more hope then *Dives* had for a drop of water in hell. But God made no proviso in that threatning against a Surety, therefore that Law was not directly broken, and yet it was not exactly fulfilled neither. What was it then? Learned men say, That God did not by this accepting of a Surety for us abrogate that Law, for then wicked men who reject Christ, could not be damned in their own personal impieties. We see God in *Ezekiel* still continuing a Law like this, *The soul that sinneth it shall die,* Ezek. 18.4. Its not then an abrogation of the Law; nor yet in the second place is it a dispensation of the threatning, for then it is properly a dispensation, when some by special priviledge are exempted from a Law, which otherwise obligeth all: but this could not be, for all mankinde was involved in it, and Christ needed not a priviledge to be exempted from it, for he was never included in it. Nor was it an equitable interpretation of the Law, for that is, when upon the reason of the Law, although not the Letter of the Law, a person is found never at first to be intended by it: but it was a *relaxation,* or rather a mercifull condescension of the Law-giver by his goodnesse and wisdome to finde out an expedient, or happy temperament: So that the Law might be satisfied, yet man finde mercy. Thus it was οὐκ κατα νομὸν, ἀλλ κατα νομον, but ὑπὲρ νομὸν, and ὑπὲρ νομον, it was not exactly according to Law, nor yet properly against it, but it was above it, and yet for it, for thereby death for sinne was brought about.

Thus

Thus you have heard Gods righteousneſſe in his word abundantly declared by Chriſt dying to obtain our Juſtification.

But the main and principal particular is, *To ſhew the righteouſneſſe of Gods work herein, or that it was an inſtance of that Juſtice in him, whereby he will puniſh ſinne.* For ſeeing the Scripture deſcribeth his Nature to be ſuch, that he is holy, that he loveth no ſinne, that he is diſpleaſed with it, and abhorreth it, it was neceſſary therefore there ſhould be a demonſtration of this Attribute of God; but if it were onely of Juſtice, then there would be no declaration of his Mercy. The wiſe God hath therefore ſo ordered it, that there ſhould be eminent demonſtrations both of his Mercy and Juſtice. Gods Juſtice therefore in our Juſtification is ſeen, in that the Lord *Chriſt* laid down his life by way of *Satisfaction* to God. He died not onely to ſhew us an example of Patience and Obedience; but the principal end of his death was to *expiate our iniquities*, and to be *Satisfactory to the Juſtice of God.* Now that this truth, though full of Comfort, yet of difficulty alſo, may be the better underſtood, we are to take notice of theſe things. The righteouſneſſe of Gods work.

First, *That in the Lord Chriſts work of Redemption for us, Divines do ſpeak of Chriſts Merit, and his Satisfaction.* And although the Scripture doth not expreſly uſe ſuch words, yet it hath that ſenſe and meaning which is intended by them, onely theſe two words have a different *Notion*; for *Merit* that doth properly reſpect the Subject for whom the good thing is *Merited*; but *Satisfaction* doth in the firſt place relate to the good of the perſon that is *ſatisfied.* Thus Chriſt by his Merit did aim at thoſe heavenly mercies, which we are to enjoy by him; but in his Satisfaction he did in the firſt place look to God, that his Glory and Honour might be repaired, which was obſcured by ſinne, yet this is not ſo to be underſtood, as if *Chriſts Satisfaction* did not alſo redound to our good; for in that God is *Satisfied*, there is thereby a way made for our *Juſtification* and *Salvation*; yea God would have his Juſtice 1. The difference between Merit and Satisfaction.

stice *Satisfied*, that so a way might be made for the Effects of his Grace. Again, There is this difference between *Merit* and *Satisfaction*; *Merit* doth properly respect the Good that is to be procured, but *Satisfaction* the Evil that is to be repelled: howsoever, in Christ we are not to make such distinctions, for in his *Merit* was a *Satisfaction*, and in his *Satisfaction*, *Merit*.

2. Secondly, Consider this, *That the Schoolmen distinguish between Satisfaction and Satispassion. Satisfaction* they make a voluntary willing undergoing of such a punishment God will have: And thus Christs Satisfaction was free and voluntary, when the *Psalmist* said, *Sacrifice and Oblation God would not have*, then saith Christ, *Lo, I come to do thy will, O God*, Psal. 40. 8. *Lo, I come*, that denoteth the willingnesse and promptnesse in him, to a task so bitter and dreadfull to flesh and blood. But *Satispassion* is, when the party doth unwillingly suffer such a punishment, as God in his Justice shall inflict on him; hence, they say, that the damned in hell, they do *satispati*, but not *satisfacere*, because all those eternal torments are inflicted on them against their will, which is the cause they rage and gnash their teeth with everlasting howlings and roarings of spirit; yet this is not to be understood so, as if they did suffer enough to recompense God, and make amends for the disobedience they are guilty of. No, if they could do so, then they would at last be acquitted, and set at liberty from those hellish chains of darknesse; but because they are never able to satisfie, they are to all Eternity chained up in their misery.

3. Four things requisite to true and proper Satisfaction, applied to prove Christs Satisfaction.

Thirdly, *To every true and proper Satisfaction, there are four things required*, which were all seen in *Christs Oblation* of himself.

1. True. *There is required that it be done to another*; for a man cannot properly be said to satisfie himself.

2. *That it be amongst equals.*

3. *That it be in such things as are the parties own that doth satisfie*, not any wayes freely received from him to whom the Satisfaction is made.

Lastly,

Lastly, *That it be in such things that are not due to him* who is *satisfied* by some other title or consideration.

I shall not at large treat on these, for I handle the Satisfactory work of Christ in our Redemption onely, as thereby is discovered the Justice and Righteousnesse of God, but because some declaration of these particulars, will make you to assent to the whole truth, *viz. That God hath not deliver us from hell and sin by his meer Power, nor by meer Mercy, but of Justice and Mercy conjoyned together.* I shall touch of them.

For the first, Satisfaction being a part of Justice, and Justice in its very Nature being to another, How could Christs Oblation of himself be a Satisfaction, seeing Christ was God also? it seemeth absurd for a man to satisfie himself. This difficulty is much discussed by the *Schoolmen*, and the *Socinians* they also urge it. *Object.*

And to answer it, Some say, that whereas Justice is alwaies said to be *ad alterum*, that is taken from *Aristotle* and other Philosophers, who were altogether ignorant of this Divine Mystery; so that as they would say of Obedience and Submission, it must be alwayes of an Inferiour to a Superiour, yet we know that Christ, who was God-man, was in a state of *Humiliation* and *Obedience*, and that unto himself, as God. But because not onely *Philosophers*, but even the *natural light* of reason doth convince, That in *Satisfaction* there must be two extreams, *The party satisfied*, and *The party satisfying*, or at least two distinct considerations; Therefore that is rejected by some.

Others they say, It is not absurd to reason, to say, a man *satisfieth himself*, that is, his *Law* and *will* which he hath appointed. Its absurd to say, A Magistrate, who having made such a penal Law, and yet willing to spare some Delinquent for just reasons, when he findes out a way to satisfie the Law, in procuring such an expedient, that he satisfieth himself.

But the best answer is, *That though Christ be God, yet considered as Mediator, as God-man, so there is a distinct respect from him as meerly God.* Now he *satisfied* as he was God-man, and

and in respect of his Mediatory Office he is to be considered, as distinct from the absolute consideration of his person, as *God*; and this the Apostle insinuates, *Gal.* 3. 20. when he saith, *A Mediator is not a Mediator of one*, that is, there must be two parties at distance, where there is a Mediation; and thus God was as absolutely considered, and man as absolutely considered: Therefore Christ he was first *medius*, did partake of both Natures; and then a Mediator, did accomplish that Office for us: Even as *Aaron*, when Gods wrath was consuming the offenders, he stood with his *Incense* between the living and the dead; This did typically represent the atonement by Christs death, its he alone that stands between the damned and saved. Its true, here are not distinct *suppositums* in Christ, but the two distinct Natures is enough to cause such a difference that we may discern the offended and him who makes the Satisfaction, and indeed the excellency of Satisfaction lieth in the equality of the compensation, not in the real diversity of the extreams; so that though in Justice amongst men there may in this respect be a more perfect way of Satisfaction, because one man doth *quoad suppositum* differ from another, yet in respect of that compensation, it hath a transcendency above all humane *Satisfaction*, and its no wonder for a thing to be exceeded by another in its generical Nature, but that to exceed the other in its specifical nature. As the heavens in their body, which is a generical nature, doth exceed mans, but mans in its specifical exceedeth the heavens. Thus in Christs Satisfaction we may consider a difference between the party *satisfied*, and him that makes the *Satisfaction*.

2. 2. In true and proper *Satisfaction* there must be also an equality; for although the party satisfying by his humiliation and submission, doth for a while subject himself as an Inferiour, yet unlesse he had an equal dignity with the party offended, he could not forgive him out of justice, but of grace and liberality. Now thus it was with Christ, if we consider him in respect of his Mediatory Office, so he is inferiour to the Father; and in this respect was in a state of humiliation; and hence it is that he referreth all glory to his Father, that he

he saith, *he commeth to do his Fathers Will*, and that his Father is greater then he; but then consider him in his Person, as God, so there is an equal dignity with God, and by this means all those acts of his humiliation, and of his most reproachful sufferings, had a *Satisfactory power* in them, yea the lowest he humbled himself, and the more he was despised, the more did his dignity discover it self: for how more noble and worthy the person is who submits himself unto a mean action, the meaner that is, the more dignity is thereby put upon it.

2. *In Christs Satisfaction there was a compensation unto God of his own*; he was not bound to suffer that death, neither though he was made man was he bound to be on earth in an obedient way to the moral command, but he might have taken mans nature, and immediately have glorified himself in heaven: Its true, supposing the end, *why* Christ came into the world, he could not but be in an obedient way to the moral Law: but so also supposing this end it could not be but that he must suffer; Therefore the Scripture puts a necessity upon it, *Luk.* 24.26. *Ought The Sonne of man must suffer, and so enter into his glory*, but more of this hereafter, as being a main point for those who deny Christs active obedience imputed to us, but yielding that his passive is, say contrary to what he delivered, that Christ was bound as a creature in respect of his humane nature to obey the moral Law, and so fulfilled that for himself, and not for us, and therefore it could not be imputed to us; but the falshood of this will appear hereafter, for the present we see, that *Christ* both in respect of his *obedience* and *sufferings* was wholly *voluntary*, and in an absolute sense not due to God any other wayes: and so comes in

The fourth particular, *That as Christ was our Mediator from that which was his own, so also that which he did in our behalf, he was not bound to do upon any other title to God, for if it had been due otherwise, then in all reason it could not have been for us, but for himself.* Its true his humane nature had all it had from God, for being a creature could not obey the will of God, or endure the conflicts of that dreadful death without assistance from God, therefore an Angel was sent to comfort him: but being this humane nature was personally united

to the God-head, and so he was in a most *ineffable* manner, *God and man*; hence it is that what he did, was of himself, and his own, therefore he said, *He had power to lay down his life, and to raise it up again*, Joh. 10. 18. If then these particulars were by a lively meditation amplified, *viz.* That Christ so full of dignity and glory in himself, even equal to God, would yet submit himself to the most shamefull and terrible torments that could be, to procure our peace and ransome; if (I say) this were powerfully thought on: Oh the astonishment and enlargings of heart it would make in thee! Nothing would grieve thee so much as the naughtinesse of thy heart, coldnesse and formality in holy duties: How sadly wouldst thou check thy self? saying, Did Christ work out my redemption with no more fervency and diligence then I pray or hear his Word? How impossible would my salvation have been, if he had as unwillingly undertook the Mediatory Office for me, as I am many times to do his will? Oh, he could say with all readinesse, *Lo I come to do thy will, O God!* though this will was to be bruised and wounded for my transgressions: but I am cold and drawing back, when I am to do his will, though it bring much joy and peace with it: Oh these dull and heavy hearts of ours! but as the Artificer hath his Engine to screw up the heavieſt timber to the top of the house: so though thy heart be earthly, stupid, inclining downward, yet the consideration of Christ dying for us, should be an admirable Engine to draw our hearts upwards.

Serm.

SERM. X.

Of the Fulneſs, Perfection, and Infinite Worth of Christs Satisfaction, as further Demonſtrating Gods Righteouſneſſe in our Juſtification.

ROM. 3. 26.

That he might be Juſt, &c.

THe truth to be demonſtrated is, *That not only Gods Mercy, but his Juſtice is declared in our Juſtification.* That which the *Socinians* deride as inconſiſtent, *viz.* a free Remiſſion of ſinne, and yet a full Satisfaction, we ſee the Scripture maintains, not indeed in the ſame reſpect, and to the ſame ſubject, for its a gracious pardon to us, though it be of juſtice to Chriſt who paid the debt.

The laſt time we ſhewed, it was a true and proper Satisfaction which Chriſt made by his bloud for our ſins. It was not an improper or metaphorical one, it had all the *requiſites to Satisfaction.*

II. Chriſts Satisfaction a copious and plentifull one.

In the next place we ſay, it was not onely a *true Satisfaction*, but it was a *copious plentifull one*, it was ſuperabundant to our ſins. There is not ſo much evil in them as there is good in Chriſt. There is not ſo much offence in them to God, as there is honour to him by Chriſt, *Heb.* 7. 25. Chriſt being there by the Apoſtle exalted above the legal Prieſts, and de-

clared to be every way fit and full for our Redeemer, its said, *He is able to save us to the uttermost*; he hath not left one farthing unpaid; There is not any great sinne or little sinne that will be charged upon thy score: Oh think not, If I had not been so great a sinner, if I had never been defiled with such and such transgressions, then there might have been some hope! This is to undervalue Christs Redemption, this is to think there is more in sinne to damn, then in Christs obedience to save. Whereas thy sins are to Christ but as a little Cloud to the glorious Sunne, his obedience exceede thy transgressions as much as his person doth thy person. Now then, if he being God, all the Nations of the world are but as one drop to him, so also must their sinnes be; if therefore thou hadst all the sinnes of all men in the world upon thee, they would be but as a drop to that ocean. This is not spoken to encourage the presumptuous sinner, for alas he hath no part in this Satisfaction, but to comfort the humbled sinner loaden with the sense of his sinnes. Though they are a burden greater then he can bear, yet not then Christ can endure, yea take quite away. Thus *John* 10.10. Christ came, *That his sheep might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly*, even more then enough; therefore its so often called, *The riches of his grace*. There is an infinite treasury, able to satisfie thee and others also. In it self indeed it is a ransom sufficient to redeem all sinners, yea a thousand worlds of sinners, for the price is not the more diminished, though it be extended to never so many. As the Sunne hath fulnesse of light to enlighten all in the world; if the blinde do not see by it, its thine indisposition, not any scarcity of light in the Sunne: Thus it is here; if all men are not acquitted by Christs death, its not because that was insufficient, as if it had not vertue enough to reach to thee as well as others; but by thy unbelief thou rejectest this soveraign remedy, otherwise there is an overflowing fulnesse in this satisfaction, thy cruise will sooner fail to receive it, then the oil be deficient: Oh then what large room hath faith to expatiate in! Sit down and dive and dive, yet thou canst not come to the bottom of Christs blood, but as the Prophet *Ezekiel* saw still

more and greater abominations, so mayest thou in the satisfactory Obedience of Christ every day discover more and more fulnesse: Its like digging where a spring and fountain is, that riseth up higher and higher, even till it come *like the waters of Noah*, to exceed the highest hils, even the most sublime meditations that can be; and that we may be fully assured of this truth, see what a notable opposition the Apostle makes *Rom.* 5. 15,16,17,18,19,20,21. between the first and second *Adam*, at large proving that Christ doth superabound in the *fruits of his grace* above the first *Adam* in the *effects of his sin*, he calls it *grace*, and the *abundance of grace*, and this abundance of grace *reigneth to life*. So that these Texts should be like so much oil poured in the wounds of every broken hearted sinner; What can satisfie him if this do not? Is there any thing that can be desired more then this? What though sin by *Adam* be thus potent, yet righteousnesse by Christ is more prevailing, so that we give not Christ the honour due unto him, while we are dejected through unbelief, and thy sins seem great, but not Christs obedience.

III. Christs Satisfaction a perfect one.

Thirdly, Its not only a *full and true Redemption, but its a perfect satisfaction*, that is, *the acceptance of Christs death did arise from the infinite worth and worthiness of it, not from the meer favour of God.* Indeed all those *Schoolmen* called the *Nominals*, they say, that the ground of Christs Satisfaction was from the kinde acceptance and benevolence in God, and therefore they make it to be of as much favour that God did accept of Christs Satisfaction, as if it had been of a pure meer man, only they grant there was more congruity in Christ to be accepted, then a meer man, because he was God also. Hence *Durand* is not afraid to say, that as by *Adam* we were made sinners; so by the same *Adam* we might have been made righteous, *Distinct.* 21. *Qu.* 2. *lib.* 3. Thus *Vorstius* while wavering did acknowledge *Christs Satisfaction*, but yet placed the ground of it in Gods gracious acceptance and receiving of it, *Lubb. Error.* 55. which certainly doth much dishonour *Christ* in the *expiatory Sacrifice*, he made for our sins. Indeed the Orthodox do acknowledge in a sound sense the necessity of Gods *gracious acceptance of Christs Satisfaction*, not as if that were

were not in it self Satisfactory from its worth, but because God was not bound to accept of a Surety in our stead, he might have charged the threatning upon our own persons, and so we our selves be charged with all the guilt of sinne. There could be no necessity either Natural or Moral, obliging or enforcing of him to receive a satisfaction by another: So that in this respect it was Gods favour, to accept of Christs sufferings for us. Again, Christ as a Mediator, is wholly the gift of God. The Scripture makes it Gods meer love to send his Sonne into the world, Christ did not merit to be a Mediator, the appointment of him for that office is attributed by Scripture wholly unto the love of God and his grace: So that it cannot be called perfect satisfaction in this sense, as if Christ by his death did so purchase our Reconciliation, that God could not in justice refuse it, for it was wholly of Gods favour that Christ was fore-ordained to be our Mediator. But then if we consider the benefits accrewing to the godly by Christs death; these were obtained by a full and perfect satisfaction, that is, God did not by way of grace, supply what was imperfect, or indulge any defect in Christs work of our Redemption, but *there was an inward equality and condignity between the price paid, and the mercy obtained*; and this is fully proved, because the Scripture when it speaks of Christs death, as *Heb.*10.10,14. and *Col.*2. and in other places, doth alwayes attribute Gospel-mercies to *his death*, and not to the grace of God. It makes the ground and cause of mercies not to be the favour of God, but the works that Christ hath wrought; therefore it speaks farre otherwise of Christ, then of the works of a godly man, *When it saith the godly are saved, presently it excludes the works we do, and giveth all to Gods grace; but when it speaks of Christ, there his righteousnesse and works are acknowledged.* Though *Paul* would not be *found in his own righteousnesse*, yet he is not afraid, but desireth to be in *Christs righteousnesse*; he knoweth no blemish, no fault or insufficiency can be found in that: So that we evidently see Christs satisfaction, is, 1. A true, proper one. 2. A plentiful and an abundant one. 3. A full and perfect one. It had in the way of Satisfaction all that God could require,

In what sense Christs Satisfaction is perfect.

quire; so that there cannot be a more compleat Satisfaction then this.

IV. More satisfactory to God then all the sins of the elect are displeasing to him.

Hence fourthly, *This obedience of Christs is far more satisfactory to God then all the sins committed by the elect, are displeasing to God.* God took more delight in his humiliation, and smelt a sweeter savour in his Sacrifice, then all our sins could offend him. Thus you heard from *Rom.* 5. the excellency of the *gift* through Christ in making righteous, did *superabound* the filthinesse of sinne in making a sinner: from this it is that God would never have suffered sinne to be, had he not thereby produced a better good then sinne could be evil. This certainly should admirably support the drooping soul: Oh thy sins afflict thee! Thou mournest because of the dishonour and unkindenesse that hath been in thy iniquities, thou cryest out, Its not my misery, my destruction troubleth me so much, as that God is offended: Oh every thing within me trembleth, while I consider God is displeased! Let this contrite spirit but turn the eye the other way, and there it may behold Christ giving God as much honour, and satisfying his holy will, as ever thy iniquities had injured him: Oh now (God saith) fury and wrath is not in me, I have no more quarrel and controversie with thee; that Christ is become thus obedient to the Crosse, its enough, I have as much as my justice could demand, my frowns are turned into smiles, my rod of iron into a Scepter of grace; certainly the meditation of this should be health to thy bones, and wine to thy heart; What is that thought wherein thou art intangled all the day long, but this? God is offended with my dulnesse, sloathfulnesse, and my thousand imperfections: Oh I am loathsome in my own eyes, much more in Gods: If *Jacob* was afraid of *Laban*; if *Jacob* was afraid to meet *Esau* his brother, when yet he was innocent, and had given no just cause of offence, much rather may I tremble, who provoke God all the day long: but then when I look upon Christs satisfaction, then I am acquitted: if there be no charge against Christ, no accusation against him, there is none against me. Shall *Jacob* then so rejoyce in seeing *Esau's* face altered to him? Shall he say, *I have seen thy face as the face of God?*

How

How much rather may the humble and beleeving sinner be filled with gladnesse, when through Christs bloud God shall be thus appeased and reconciled with him! if thy unworthinesse make thee diffident, so that thou canst not plead Gods free grace; yet here is an argument put in thy mouth from Christs expiatory Sacrifice, that thou mayest say, O Lord, I am unworthy, but it is just and right that Christ obtain what he died for! Its grace to me, but it is righteousnesse to Christ.

V. Fifthly, *We are to consider in sinne two things, the* malum *creaturæ, and the* malum Dei. The evil of the *creature* is that noxious and damnable effect of it, whereby it instateth a man in a condition of all misery; the evil towards *God* in sinne is that whereby it doth injure and offend him, being nothing but contempt of him, and if it were possible, working the very destruction of God: Now Christ by his death doth satisfie God for sinne, principally and in the first place, as it is offensive to God, as it dishonours him; and then secondarily and by redundancy, as its destructive of the creature; for if we remove the cause, we take away the effect; if the dishonour and offence to God be removed, then is the destructive and damnable effects of sinne also taken away; onely by this we should learn, in all our humiliation and debasement for sinne, to be affected with that which is the greatest evil in it. Christ in all those unspeakable agonies of his, did satisfie chiefly for sinne, as it was Gods offence, as it was a dishonour to him; so should our hearts be broken and contrite within us, mainly because we have offended him, as *David*, Psal. 51. *Against thee, thee onely have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight*, because it was against God, and in his sight, this brake his bones, this pounded his heart to dust. It was not his childes death, nor all the other miseries accompanying his sinne, that did so break and bruise him, as that God was hereby displeased: Oh then that we were such a spiritual people, that could apprehend what is most to be bewailed in our transgressions; if fear of judgement and hell be the onely and alone cause of all thy trouble, thou art not yet so spiritual, as thou oughtest to be.

The

The losse of Gods favour should be more unto thee, then all temporal evils.

Sixthly, *The righteousnesse of God and his Justice is seen in Christs Satisfaction from a threefold respect.* There are three grounds of the infinity of worth in Christs obedience, and therefore it being then infinite upon all those Titles, its plain, that God would not forgive only by grace, but by justice also. The infinite worth of his obedience did arise,

VI. The infinite worth of Christs obedience from three grounds.

1. *From the dignity of his Person,* he was God-man; so that all the obedience of Angels and men if put together, could not amount to the excellency of Christs Satisfaction: Stand amazed at thy happinesse, O believer, thou hast gained by thy losse, thou hast lost the obedience of a creature, but the obedience of an infinite person is now made thine; hence its many times called the righteousnesse of God; among other reasons, because its such as God is satisfied with, he looketh for no better, yea there can be no better. Though God hath infinite treasures of wisdom and omnipotency, yet he cannot provide a better obedience for us then this is: As God cannot love a better object then himself; This is not impotency, but potent perfection, whether this infinite dignity derived from the person of Christ to his actions, be a *physical entity* affecting the operations, or a *moral relation* by way of resultancy, though disputed by *Schoolmen,* yet must necessarily be granted, that its a *moral relation,* and so derived to every mediatory action: as if the whole value of money were only from the stamp and superscription it beareth; then whether the materials were gold, or silver, or iron, or leather, it would be nothing to the purpose, the stamp would make it to be of like worth; seeing therefore that Christ in all his mediatory actions, was God as well as man, thereby was an infinite dignity communicated to them (I say *his* mediatory actions) because some question whether Christ did not many humane actions that were either wholly indifferent, or to a meer natural end, and no higher, but that must needs be derogatory to Christ, because *To us he was born, to us he was given, to us he lived, and to us he died.* All that Christ was, and did, or suffered, did mediately or immediately tend

I.

to our Redemption, and our Saviour intended that in all things.

2. 2. *It was infinite, not only in respect of the dignity of the person, but also* respectu rei oblatæ, *the price offered, which was himself a Sacrifice for our sins*; which made the Apostle preferre this thing above that by *gold* or *precious stones*; So that if we consider what that price or oblation was, we must needs grant an infinite dignity to it.

3. 3. *It was infinite in respect of the manner of the oblation; or the whole mediatory Office of Christ was discharged in that manner, that it did also merit at Gods hand.* It is true the habitual and actual grace of Christ in his humane nature, was not entatively infinite, for so onely God is; but because of the personal union, there was infinite worth redounding to every thing he did: yet seeing the grace and holinesse of Christ, which he shewed in all that he did, was not limited, as in creatures *(for he received not the Spirit in measure.)* therefore the holy manner of doing all things God required, was acceptable unto God.

Obj. And if you object, Seeing that the dignity of Christs person did put such infinite worth upon what Christ did; Why then did not any one action satisfie? Why might not that internal acceptance, which he declared, *Behold, I come to do thy will, O God!* have been enough without death it self? What need many actions of infinite dignity, seeing there cannot be more then infinite?

Answ. To this it is answered, That infinite worth, simply as so, is not enough, unlesse it be ordered and proportioned according to the will of him, who is to be satisfied; for if a man should give for a captive prisoner an infinite summe of money, yet if not according to such a way and a condition, as the conquerour prescribeth, though that summe of money were sufficient in it self to redeem a thousand such as that prisoner is, yet because not according to the condition prescribed, it could not be called a Satisfaction. And thus because Gods will was, that a sinner should die, though never so many glorious actions, having an infinite digniky, were accomplished; yet they could not be Satisfaction,

as

as to this matter, unleſſe there be ſuch a death as was threatned.

VII. Seventhly, *Becauſe Chriſt in his Mediatory Office, was thus infinitely worthy: Hence it is that no meer creature, Angel nor man, though endowed with all imaginable perfection, could ſatisfie for mans ſinnes.* Some of the Schoolmen have concluded the contrary, aſſerting, That a pure creature might have ſatisfied: but as the Apoſtle argued, *If righteouſneſſe come by the Law, then Chriſt died in vain*; So if Salvation and Juſtification could come any other way, then Chriſt did needleſly endure all thoſe torments and agonies; and certainly it cannot be thought that Chriſt ſhould put himſelf into ſuch a ſtate of Humiliation, if any ſuppoſed creature could have done it. That is true of *Leo*, If he had not been man, *non præberet exemplum*, he could not have given us an example; and if he had not been God, *non præberet remedium*, he could not have procured a remedy. Therefore they do dangerouſly erre, who hold Chriſt a Mediator onely in his humane Nature, as that *Stancarus* of whom its reported, *Andr. Oſiand. Diſput.* that he would ſay, There was more in *Peter Lumbard*, (who held Chriſt a Mediator according to his humane nature) then there was in an hundred *Luthers*, two hundred *Melanchthons*, or four hundred *Calvins*. But if Chriſt were wholly Mediator as man, then man as man might make an atonement to the infinite Juſtice of God, which is impoſſible: ſeeing whatſoever ſuch a ſuppoſed creature could do, was wholly from the gift of God; and the more he did, the more he was obliged to God: Now Satisfaction could not be if all were of grace and Gods bounty; and in this ſenſe it is, that *Calvin* ſaid, *lib. 2. Inſtitut. cap.* 17. If we ſhould abſolutely and ſimply oppoſe Chriſt to the judgement of God, there could be no place for merit, becauſe in man there could not be found any ſuch worth. This reaſon doth plainly evince, That *Calvin* ſpeaks of Chriſt, as ſuppoſed a meer man; ſo that its a violent perverting of his meaning by the Jeſuite *Sandaus Hydrus Hollandicus*, when he would from this infer, That by *Calvins* principles, the Doctrine of Satisfaction

cannot be maintained. Thus virulent also is *Mentzer* the *Lutheran* from that passage in *Calvin* and *Meisner*, who though otherwise a learned *Lutheran*, from other doctrinal principles of the *Calvinists*, would lay down this conclusion, He that would avoid *Photinianism* must eschew *Calvinism*, *Anthrop. Sac. Dec.* 3. But all this is maliciously affirmed, for none are more solid maintainers of this truth then they are.

VIII. Eighthly, *From hence we may see how infinitely we are obliged to God for all the grace we have.* There is not the pardon of the least sinne, or the least degree of grace, but it came unto thee upon a dear rate; it was more then if God should have created a world only for thee; yea thou art more bound to God for the least spiritual mercy thou hast, then all the *Angels* in heaven are for all the grace they have; for then God did but will and command, and they were filled with all holinesse immediately; but here *Christ* must die, he must become a *Sacrifice*, and *die a cursed death*, ere we could have a drop of mercy: Oh what inlarged hearts should we have upon the discovery of any Gospel-mercy vouchsafed to us! How much was required ere this could be? Every mercy was *purchased* by the *precious bloud of Christ*; so that our hearts and mouths should be filled with joy and praises: how much did this work on *Paul*? Because *Christ loved him, and gave himself for him*, Gal. 3.

SERM. XI.

Why it was necessary our Redemption should be by way of Justice, with Distinctions of natural Necessity. And whether God could have Remitted Sin without Satisfaction, modestly discussed.

ROM. 3. 26.

To declare his Righteousness, that he might be just, &c.

THe final cause of our Justification is in this Text set down *generally*, and then divided into two particulars, The *finis cujus*, and the *finis cui*.

The *finis cujus* I shall at this time accomplish; and for the other, *viz. finis cui*, I shall take another Text. *The end for the sake whereof God will justifie us through Christs blood, as a Satisfactory Atonement, is to declare his Justice and Righteousnesse*, that he doth not onely abhorre it, but will punish it, with his severest wrath, and therefore spareth not his Sonne, when he will become Surety for a sinner; That Christ made a true and proper Satisfaction by his blood to Gods Justice, hath been proved at large.

Why it was necessary we should be redeemed in a way of Justice.

Let us proceed to shew the grounds of this way, *Why it was necessary that we should be redeemed in a way of Justice, as well*

well as of Mercy and Power. For some decry this as a most absurd and prophane imagination. Now besides the Scripture Texts, which you have heard plainly declaring Gods will to redeem man in this manner, and no other, we may conceive two grounds of it.

1. From the nature of sin.

And the first is, *From the Nature of sinne.* It is of an *infinite guilt*, and hath an *infinite evil* in the nature of it, and therefore no meer creature, but that person who had an infinite dignity could make Satisfaction for it. Its a Rule received by all, That by how much greater and more noble the person is, to whom the offence is made, by so much the offence is the greater, as *Jude vers.* 8, 9. aggravates some mens sins from the excellency of the object, *They speak evil of dignities.* When *Shimei* cursed *David*, the King and chief Governour of the Land, it was more hainous then if he had done it to one of the meaner sort. Hence in respect of the object, The crucifying of *Christ* was a crimson sinne, because he was *the Sonne of God, and the Lord of glory*; The death of all the men in the world was not so much as his: Now seeing the majesty and honour of God is infinite, and there is no proportion between a creatures glory, and Gods glory: Therefore every sinne being injurious to this Majesty, and offensive of his glory, it must have an infinite evil and guilt in it.

Indeed the *Schoolmen* dispute, Whether sinne can properly be said to be an infinite evil? Some grant, that in some respect it may be called infinite, because its against an infinite God, whose Majesty is incomprehensible, but this is wholly extrinsecal, for God is not the intrinsecal object of the soul, no not when it enjoyeth him in the most happy manner. Now if this be granted, its enough to us, that seeing sinne hath at least thus farre an infinite demerit in it, because committed against a God of unsearchable Glory and Majesty, therefore none can make compensation or satisfie, but such an one, who hath as much honour and worth in him, as sinne brought dishonour; and this can onely be *God and man*, who though as a man did things *humiliter*, yet as God they were done *sublimiter*.

But there are others that say the evil of sinne is infinite *intrinsecally*, because it doth offend God, *in quantum est offendibilis*, as farre as he can be offended; for that sinne doth not actually hurt God, and destroy him, is from his infinite perfection: if the sinner by his sinne could effect the ruine of the Divine Majesty, he would. Hence by the *first Commandment* we are forbidden, *To make to our selves any other gods but him*; Every sinner sets up another God besides him: Now that is to offend God as highly as he can be offended; Every sinner making the object of his sinne another God, provokes God as much as God can be provoked; Those that made *their belly their God*, Phil. 3. 19. And *covetousnesse* being called *Idolatry*, Col. 3. 5. as the Poet said,

Clausum arcâ custodit Jovem.

These sinners sitting up creatures in the room of God, offend him infinitely; so that if a creature could love God *in quantum est amabilis*, that would be infinite love; hence God onely loveth himself; so because sinne is an offence against him, as farre as he can be offended, therefore it may well be said to have an infinite evil and guilt in it. Neither (say the same Authors) will this make every sinne alike, because one infinite cannot be more then another; for although in respect of the aversion from God, and offence to him, all are alike, and therefore all are punished equally *pœnâ damni*, with the losse of God; yet in respect of their conversion or turning to the creature, which is the cause of turning from God, so there is a difference: As (say they) darknesse is in it self a total privation of light, yet as there may be causes impeding this light, so one darknesse may be greater then another: Howsoever these things are, yet to be sure the Scripture speaks of sinne, as an *offence*, *rebellion* and *despising of God*; and he being the *Jehovah*, and *fountain* of all good and excellency, sinne doth thereby derive such guilt upon the offender, that unlesse there be a greater good, then all the sins collectively are an evil, there cannot be any true and proper satisfaction. And indeed the wisdom of God would not have suffered evil to be, had he not known thereby to procure a greater good.

The-

2. From the nature of his justice.

The second main ground, why God doth justifie by way of satisfaction, is, *From that glorious property of his Justice, whereby as he hateth sinne, so he doth propend to punish it.* This property we have asserted by many places of Scripture, because the *Socinians* deny it, making Mercy and Justice (or as they call it anger) no properties in God, but meer voluntary effects of his free will, which being laid down as a foundation, then the superstruction must be, That Christ did not die by way of Satisfaction, at least, there was no necessity of it. But we affirm, That as Mercy, Omnipotency and Wisdom, so Justice also, whereby he enclineth to punish sin, is natural to God.

Indeed even amongst the Orthodox, there is difference of Judgements, at least in this point, Whether *primitive Justice* was so natural to God, supposing sinne to be, that he could not remit it without Satisfaction? But happily by a distinction or two the difference may be reconciled.

Distinctions of natural necessities. And whether God could remit sin without Satisfaction.

1. Concerning *Natural*, which *Paraus Comment. in 2d cap. Gen, & cap 9. ad Rom. Dub.* 12. hath out of *Aquinas*, That a thing may be said to be natural two wayes, either, 1. When it necessarily and meerly floweth from the principles of nature; thus the fire burneth naturally, the stone descends naturally. Or secondly, When it floweth from the principles of nature, but by the mediation and intervention of free will. Thus to understand, to will, to laugh, to speak, are natural actions to man, yet so as the exercise of them is subjected unto our free will. Thus when we say its natural to God to punish and correct sinne, we mean in the later sense; not as if God must necessarily punish as soon as ever it is committed, or that he must punish to the utmost every time, as natural Agents work to the utmost they can: but the exercise of this, is subject to his wisdome and liberty.

2. When we say God doth necessarily punish sinne, because he is just in his nature, we must distinguish of necessity, 1. There is an absolute and immutable necessity: Thus God only is necessarily, it being impossible that God should not be. 2. There is a limited and respective necessity, and that sometime,

sometimes from the efficient cause, because he is thus or thus disposed; as when it is said, 1 *Cor.* 10. *There must be heresies*, that is, partly in respect of the efficient cause, because there will be ignorance and pride alwayes in men, although the Text mentioneth there onely the final cause.

2. From the material cause. Thus death is necessary and inevitable, because we have principles of corruptibility within us.

3. From the formal cause, because that is immutable and unchangeable.

4. From the final cause, supposing such an end. Now its true in the former sense, it was not necessary to have Christs Satisfaction; for it was not absolutely necessary that mankinde should be redeemed: God might have passed it by, as he did the apostate Angels. Hence *Heb.* 2. 16. Gods love is aggravated, *That he took not the Nature of Angels, but the seed of Abraham.*

But for the later kindes of necessity, some are true here, as there was a necessity of pardoning sinde by Satisfaction, in respect of the efficient cause God, seeing by nature he loaths and hates sin.

2. From the final cause, seeing he purposed in procuring our Salvation to glorifie his Mercy and Justice, he would not punish all sinne with eternal damnation, nor yet let all go unpunished, but would manifest himself both just and merciful; supposing this, it was necessary that sin should not be pardoned without satisfaction.

Thirdly, A thing may be absolute and necessary, either 3.
quoad exercitium actus, in respect of the exercise of the act, or the specification and manner of it; or rather thus, The objects of some properties in God, may be said to be necessarily. Or secondly, The objects supposed, then the acts are necessary. To Gods Omnipotency there is required no object, because it makes its objects: and To to Gods wisdom there is required no qualification in the object, for he can order every thing to a glorious end; but to Gods Mercy and Justice, there are not onely required objects, but objects so qualified either with grace and sinne. Therefore when we

say, that it is natural to God to punish sinne, we mean not, as if God must naturally create a world, and procure man to be a sinner, but these things were done by Gods free-will; only suppose man doth fall and become a sinner, then Gods Justice requireth the punishment of it; So that it was free to God whether he would create man or no; yet supposing man is fallen, then its not free whether he will be just in his actions to the sinner or no.

These distinctions might clear the point, but because even amongst the Orthodox, there are different assertions in this matter, let us discusse it a little more.

There are several learned Authors, that hold Gods Justice in correcting and punishing sinne is so natural, that he cannot but punish it, or require Satisfaction, otherwise he should deny himself and his own Nature; and this is not to derogate from his Omnipotency and Perfection, no more then to say, he cannot lie; but it ariseth from his infinite Perfection. Thus hold many excellent Writers, *Piscator amica Collati. cum Vorst. Lubbertus 99. Error. Vorst. Paraus in cap. 2. Genes. & cap. 9. ad Rom. Dub. 12. Brochems Animad. in Vorst. Martin. de persona Christi. Steg. Photin. pag. 506, 507.* and many others.

There are again others that say, If God be considered absolutely in respect of his power, and not upon a supposition of his decree, which is *de facto* to let no sinne go unpunished, but to punish it either in the person or his surety; In this absolute sense they say, God might freely have remitted sin without any Satisfaction, and that there were other wayes of our salvation then by redemption through Christ. *Augustine* several times affirmeth this, especially *Ser. 3. de Sanct. Domini*, God saith he, would so repair man, that he would not let sinne go unpunished, because he is just, nor yet let it be *incurable*, because he is merciful, *Potuit aliter fieri quantum ad potentiam Medici*, &c. If we consider the power of the Physitian, he could have done otherwise: but that place is most notable and urged by all that go this way, *lib. 3. de Trin. 13. cap. 10.* where he saith, Another way of healing our misery, was possible to God, but there was none more convenient

then

then this; Though these places do assert another way possible, yet they do not determine whether that other way would have been without Satisfaction or not: *Calvin* indeed speaks peremptorily to this purpose, *in cap. 15. John v. 13. Poterat vel solo verbo, aut nutu nos redimere,* &c. God might by a meer word or command have redeemed us, but he took this way through his Son, that his love might be made more manifest. And the *Schoolmen* generally following *Lumbard* their Master, and he also following *Augustine* from the forementioned place, do with one consent conclude, God might forgive sinne without any Satisfaction, and that Christs death is necessary onely *hypothetically*, upon a supposition of Gods Decree, to take this way rather then another. Hence *Sandaus* the Jesuite, (*Hydrus Holland.*) makes the Catholick truth, as he cals it, to be between the *Socinians* and the *Calvinists*, determining, that God will not *de facto* pardon sinne without Satisfaction, against the *Socinians*; yet absolutely he could have done otherwise, against the Protestants. But his *malice* deceiveth him in this, for many Orthodox Protestants, yea and *Calvin* himself acknowledge, God might have redeemed us by his sole Command or word. And of late the learned Doctor *Twisse* hath a digression on purpose against *Piscator* and *Lubbertus* in this very point, *Vind. lib. 1. de elect. Digress. 8.* But seeing both *Lubbertus* and D. *Twisse* himself do acknowledge that distinction mentioned by *Pareus* about a two-fold naturality, I see no reason why he should so industriously confute *Lubbertus*, neither do his Arguments seem pressing.

For my own thoughts I shall declare them in these particulars:

1. *Its agreed on by all hands* (except the *Socinians*) *that whatsoever God might have done, yet he hath plainly revealed his will, that he will not pardon sin, no not the least sin without a price paid, and an atonement made.* God hath decreed this way and no other, he hath revealed himself to be a God *that will not acquit the guilty*, and that will judge even the least sinnes, though they be but *idle thoughts* and *words*: Seeing therefore God hath pitched upon this way, it seemeth *superfluous* and

uſeleſſe to diſpute about the poſſibility of another way, and indeed it would be miſ-ſpent time, but that the *Socinians* neceſſarily plunge us into it, denying any ſuch Juſtice of God, as thereby to puniſh ſin, but making it wholly arbitrary to puniſh or not puniſh: ſo that to evidence this truth the more about Gods righteouſneſſe requiring Chriſts Satisfaction, we may ſoberly and modeſtly enquire into it.

Yet in the ſecond place, *What Doctor is there, though never ſo ſubtil, angelical or profound, that can poſitively determine this?* Who knoweth the deep treaſuries of Gods power? Who can comprehend his nature? Therefore it becometh either party of the diſſentients to deliver their judgement ſoberly, and not to condemn one another, ſeeing one pretends a zeal to Gods Juſtice, that it would be derogatory to ſuffer the contempt of his Majeſty without puniſhing; and the other they declare a zeal to Gods Omnipotency, that he is not to be bounded as men, but having no Superiour above him, may do what he pleaſe.

The Authors opinion in the point.

Theſe 2 things premiſed, I do incline to that opinion, which holdeth, *That a corrective or vindicative Juſtice is natural and eſſential to God, ſo that he cannot but puniſh ſin, or have ſatisfaction, and an atonement by a Surety:* Provided that *natural* be taken in this ſenſe, for that which floweth from nature, yet by the help of free-will and reaſon; as we ſay, to laugh, to ſpeak, to will, is natural to a man. And there are theſe Reaſons preponderating with me for it.

[1.] Firſt, *The Scripture when it ſpeaketh of Gods puniſhing ſinne, doth not attribute it meerly to his Will and Decree, but to his juſt nature, becauſe he is a righteous God.* Thus *Pſal.* 11. 7. when the Pſalmiſt had deſcribed the judgements of God upon the ungodly, he inferreth it from the righteouſneſſe of his Nature, *Becauſe he is a righteous God*, he will thus puniſh them alſo. *Rev.* 16. 15. The judgements which God there executed upon the Churches enemies, are ſaid to be, becauſe he is a righteous God: Seeing therefore that the Scripture when it ſpeaks of the puniſhing of ſin, doth not attribute it meerly to his free-will and power, but becauſe of his juſt nature, whereby he hateth ſin, and as Judge of the world will be avenged

on

on it; Therefore we may affirm, such justice as its an attribute, is essential to God; though the effects of it, are subject to his free-will, to punish when, where and how he will.

Secondly, *If God punish sinne meerly from his will, then it must follow, that sin or no sin is all one to him.* That God in his own nature is not more moved with all the blasphemies and impieties of the world, then if there were none at all; For if God by nature doth not encline to punish sin, but its meer will, then it is no more then when God purposed to create the world, or to make it rain: As it was nothing to Gods nature to make a world, or not make it; to cause it to rain, or not to rain; such an indifferent thing sinne must be to God; But how can this stand with those places, that say, *God is of purer eyes then to behold iniquity*, Hab. 1? And that, *God is angry with the wicked every day?* And if the Adversaries think it hard to say, That God cannot pardon the least sin without satisfaction, certainly it is more difficult to say, That all the sins of the world may be forgiven, though men never humble themselves, and repent of them. 2.

Thirdly, *If God punish sin meerly from his will, and not from his Nature, How is it that all men have implanted in them such principles about God, that he will punish sin?* Why is it, that upon the committing of any sinne, there is trembling, and a remorse of conscience? Neither can it be said, This is because God by his Word hath revealed he will punish it; for even Heathens and Pagans they have such implantations upon their conscience, they have been able to say, that a wicked man though he may be *securus*, yet he is never *tutus*, that Gods judgement hangs over his head, as a drawn sword. And this the Apostle verifieth of them, *Rom.* 1. 32. *That they know the just judgement of God.* How came they to know this, but from an ingrafted principle of conscience within? 3.

Fourthly, *The Scripture speaking of damnation, and the punishment of sin, attributeth it not only to God ordaining such a reward, but to the merit and desert of sin it self.* Thus *Rom.* 1. 32. they that do such things are said to be *worthy of death*; Why worthy? Or whence doth the desert of hell arise? Is it meerly 4.

ly because God will? Or not rather, because sinne being a dishonour to God doth deserve it? If then sinne do deserve eternal wrath, then its from Gods justice, not from his meer will that sin is punished.

5. Fifthly, *This seemeth much to derogate from the Lord Christ, if he came into the world, and to undergo all those agonies he did for sin, and yet sin might have been forgiven without it.* If sin could have been pardoned without Christ, why was the beloved Son of God made a curse, and died such a reproachful death for us? And certainly, seeing that our Redemption must be by way of Satisfaction, and that requireth a person of infinite dignity, I wonder how any can think any other way was possible, unlesse we may imagine that the Father or the holy Ghost might have been incarnated, for no meer creature could be a Mediator to reconcile God and man; and certainly, seeing that *Austin* himself saith, Though other wayes were possible, yet none is so convenient; this is to give up their cause; for who can tell, whether God could not finde out a more convenient way as well as possible? And if not, then certainly we must conclude, that such is the excellency and perfection of God, that he alwayes takes the most excellent and perfect way. And thus much shall suffice for the clearing of this main Article of Religion.

Use. And let the godly soul make this Use of it, to admire the wisdom and knowledge of God, who, when mankinde was utterly lost, and as hopelesse as the Apostate Angels; When Justice stood with a fiery sword to keep man from all happinesse, that then God should provide a way for our salvation. This is that glorious mystery into which the Angels desire to search, though not so much concerned in it; and shall not the godly man much more study it? For now he hath two tenures to hold his pardon and salvation by, Free grace and Justice; Free grace, in respect of himself; Justice, in respect of Christ. If thou think Free grace will not acquit such a wretch as thou art, then know a full price is laid down to discharge thee of all thy sins: So that now when the Prince of the world comes against thee, thou mayest say in some sense as Christ did, *He can finde nothing in thee*, for how can he accuse

thee, seeing Christ is thy Surety? The bond hath been sued upon him, he would not leave one farthing unpaid. Therefore the godly man may live and die without fear, he may well with *Paul* cry out, *Who can lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? Its Christ that died.* This answers Law, Devils, Conscience, Justice, and all. As *Paul* said to *Philemon* concerning *Onesimus*, *If he have wronged thee, or oweth thee any thing, put it on my account:* So doth our Mediator to God, If these owe thee any thing, or have wronged thy Majesty, put it on me. *Paul* indeed added, *I Paul have written it with my own hand*, but Christ hath ratified and confirmed it with his own bloud.

SECT.

SECT. III.

Of the Justification of a Sinner.

SERM. XII.

Sheweth what Justification is, and what are the Adjuncts, Properties, and Effects of it.

ROM. 8. 33.

It is God that Justifieth.

THough humane Histories relate the stately pomp and wonderful glory that great Emperours and Conquerours have triumphed in, yet who so readeth from the 31. *vers.* to the last of this Chapter, must say, that all the *Cæsars* in their highest glory were not equal to *Paul* in the *heavenly triumph* he makes in these verses; so that as *Elijah* had his fiery chariot carrying him to heaven, thus this part of the Chapter may be called *Pauls Divine Chariot*, whereby he is exalted as high as heaven, with a powerful conquest over all enemies.

The Apostle having in the former part of the Chapter treated

treated of many admirable priviledges Gods children do enjoy at *vers.* 31. he begins to be overwhelmed in his Meditations, and suffers his spiritual *deliquiums*, as being not able to say any more, *What shall we say to these things?* As if he had said, My soul suffereth violence within me, I cannot go any further. A sea of eloquence is but a drop to this infinite matter; Like the Queen of *Sheba*, seeing the glory of *Solomon*, and beginning to faint within her; thus doth *Paul*, beholding the excellent glory God puts on his children, and having after this divine extasie, something recovered himself, he instances in three sad temptations which usually afflict and perfundate the godly, giving three strong Antidotes and Cordials against them.

The first temptation is from the external power and force, which the enemies of Gods Church use to the crushing and breaking of the godly, though Christ will at last break them with *a rod of iron*, yet in the mean time they thus break his people. Now to this, saith *Paul*, *If God be for us, Who can be against us?* If God be for us, it is not a speech of doubting, but raciocinating; *Si* is for *Quoniam*, seeing God is for us, Who can be against us? Is any greater then God? Is any more powerfull then him? Thou maist well oppose God to all enemies; they have earthly power, but I have God; they boast of their Titles and Names, but how glorious are the Titles and Attributes of God?

A second temptation is from the want of these necessary, outward comforts. The people of God are sometimes not the *Divesses*, but the *Lazarusses* of the world; Though they have an interest in all promises, yet for the present they may be destitute and wanting all things. To this the Apostle giveth a strong Cordial, *If he hath given us his Sonne*, then whom nothing is dearer or more precious, *How shall he not with him give us all things else?* What is food and raiment to Christ?

A third temptation, which is the sorest of all, is from *sin*, The *Law* accusing us, the *Devil* charging us, and our *own hearts* and *consciences* condemning us. Now to this, see what a tri-

a triumphing challenge he makes, *Who shall lay any thing to Gods elect? It is God that justifieth.*

So that in the words we have a quick and sharp *interrogation*, with a vehement and compleat *responsion*.

The *interrogation* is, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect?* He doth not say, Who shall condemn them? though he mentioneth that in the next place, *But who shall* so much *as charge them?* draw up a bill and indite them? Many men may be accused and indited, and yet not condemned, but here the Apostle doth not only deny the later, but the former also, none can *condemn them*, yea none can *charge them* or accuse them, for the reason is, *It is God that justifieth.* Some of old read this also interrogatively, *Doth God that justifieth them? Doth he lay to their charge?* But it runnes most smoothly without an interrogation.

In the words we have the *efficient cause, God*; and the *action* attributed to him, *he justifieth*, or ὁ δικαιῶν, *who is justifying*, *If God justifie none can accuse*, seeing he is the supream Judge, and all the mulcts which issue out of the Courts of conscience go in his name. If therefore they have not Gods Name and Authority to warrant them, they are not to be regarded; if God gives an acquittance or discharge, none dare oppose, for the Greek word δικαιῶν I shall speak more in the Explication.

Observ. *That there is a glorious priviledge vouchsafed to the believer, which the Scripture cals Justification.* This is the very Marrow of Doctrinal and Practical Divinity, and therefore we are to give the more attendance to it. *Luther* said, *Præfat. in Galat.* That this Article of Justification did reign in his heart, that night and day his thoughts did flow and reflow about it. Its the Centre wherein all theological truths do meet. Its the Ocean that by its several streams watereth and refresheth the Paradise, the Church of God. Its the Ark of faith, all Religion is kept pure, while this is kept pure. Its accounted one instance of the prophetical spirit in *Luther*, that he fore-saw this Doctrine would be after his time greatly obscured; and indeed not onely *Papists*, but all sorts of *Hereticks* have thrown many dead flies in this precious ointment; so that the

Doctrine

Doctrine of it being of such vast consequence, it cals for all able learned men to keep this Spring pure: As every wound in the heart is mortal, so every errour about Justification is dangerous: Therefore it is a licentious expression of that *Leviathan, Hobs Deceiver, cap.* 18. who sports himself in all *Political, Ethical* and *Theological matter*, when he saith, The Disputations about justifying faith are meerly Philosophical, and so not essential to Religion; and thus the *Remonstrants* makes it not a straws matter, whether we say, *Fides qua viva*, or *quâ viva justificat*, whereas these particulars declare a vast difference; as when we speak of Christ, it would be to say, *Christus qui Deus est moritur*, and *quâ Deus est*, Christ who is God died, and as he is God he died, the former is a truth, the later is blasphemy; and besides this Doctrine is very necessary practically, how many thousands are ignorant of it, that know not what Justification is, that which they need more then their daily bread: that which they want as much as their breath, even every moment, of this they are wholly unskilful.

Let us therefore enter into this Land of *Canaan* that *floweth with milk and honey*. And

Divers Propositions tending to cleat the point of justification.

I. Of the signification of the word.

First, *Let us be informed what it is, and afterwards what the adjuncts and properties and effects of it.* And if the Philosophers assertion be, that by the name of a thing we come to the nature of it; this must hold much more in this point of Justification, whereas the matter and thing it self is peculiar and proper, revealed only by the Word, so is the name and phrase to expresse it by, for the Greek word δικαιῶ and δικαιῶσαι, answering the Hebrew word *Hizdick* in *Hyphil* is used in another signification, then commonly it is with humane Authors, for *Hyschius* makes it to signifie μαστιγῶν and νουθετῶν.

Suidas attributes two significations to it, κολάζειν to punish, and δικαίως νομίζειν, to judge that which is just and equal, and for the most part it is used of things and not of persons.

Stephanus, Thes. ling. Tom. 1. alledgeth many places out of prophane Authors, where the word is used, and all to this purpose to judge that which is just, or to be as much as ἀξιῶ or simply to judge, and sometimes from κατακρίνω to condemn

demn, and with *Aristotle* δικάζεσθαι is opposed ἀδικεῖσθαι to obtain our right, which when a man doth not, but is unjustly dealt with, then he is said ἀδικεῖσθαι; but in the Scripture use of the word it is most commonly attributed to persons, and signifieth not to punish or condemn, as often with humane Authours; hence their publick places of punishment were called δικαστήρια, as *Hesychius* saith; & *Nazianzen* cals hell, or the place there of the damned, μέλλοντα δικαστήρια, *but to justify and absolve, to acquit a person as righteous:* And herein the New Testament followeth the *Septuagint* use of it, although the word be used most frequently by *Paul.* Now the *Septuagint* they translate the word *Hizdick*, or as if us'd in other conjugations most commonly by δικαιόω or δικαίωμαι about twenty four times, but once by δικαίον ἀποφαίνω, *Job* 27.5. we render it, *God forbid I should justifie you,* once δικαίων κρίνω, *Prov.* 27. 5. *He that justifieth the wicked,* δικαιῶ ἀποφαίνομαι, *Job* 13.18. *I know I shall be justified,* ὅτι ὁμαι δικαιος εἶναι, *Should a man full of talk be justified?* καθαρος εἰμι, *Job* 4. 17. *Shall a man be more just then his Maker?* Dan. 8.14. καθαρισθήσεται τὸ ἅγιον, *The Sanctuary shall be cleansed,* in the *Hebrew* it is, *Shall be justified,* but the word is in *Niphal.* In all other places the *Septuagint* useth δικαιῶ or δικαιῶμαι, and in all of them, when the word is used in *Hiphil, It signifieth either the absolving or acquitting of one righteous, or the declaration of a mans righteousnesse by some outward testimony.* This being clear in the Scripture, and asserted as the first Proposition, therefore we lay down a second,

II. Secondly, *That to justifie in a Scripture sense is to absolve or pronounce a man righteous, not to infuse or put righteousnesse into a man.* Here is the great contest between the Papists and us; We say the word is taken from Courts of Justice, when a person accused is absolved and so used in a juridical sense; They say it signifieth to make inherently just and righteous, as *calefaction* signifieth to make inherently hot, and Sanctification to make inherently holy. Now this is not a vain strife of words, for the great Article of our Religion depends upon the right discovery of the use of the word: If to justifie signifie to give us an inherent righteousnesse, then by that we

may

may appear before God; in the confidence of that we may live and die; we must still look to something within us; but if to justifie signifie *to acquit us being accused for sinne through the grace of God, and the righteousnesse of Christ*, then we are to go out of our selves to renounce every thing that is ours, we are to look without us, we are with *Paul*, Phil. 3. *Not to be found in our own righteousnesse, but that which is by faith in Christ.* It is the judgement of the Protestants, that the word is constantly used so in the Scripture, and that the adversaries are never yet able to produce any one place to the contrary, insomuch that *Bellarmine* himself confesseth, this is the most common use of the word. Neither do the Papists onely interpret the word *Justifie* for *Justification*, or making righteous by habitual and actual righteousnesse. But the *Socinians* also, and all their Interpolators. *Castelli de Justif.* doth industriously set himself to prove, that to justifie is to heal a man of his sins by inward sanctification, though he acknowledge the Scripture-use of the word in the sense before-mentioned, neither can he instance in any one place to the contrary.

But when we say its a *juridical* word, the meaning is not, as if it were applied only to Judges in their *judicial acts*; for its many times applied to *particular persons* justifying either themselves or others, only we say, when applied to God, it signifieth a *judicial absolution*, for here in this Text there are *accusations* and *condemnations* supposed, to which *Justification* is opposed; and indeed if to *justifie* were to endow us with holinesse and righteousnesse, then considering how imperfect and weak the best mans graces are, there would be enough to lay to his charge; so that with *Cain* he would be forced to cry out, *My sins are greater then I can bear.* Indeed there is a speech of *Calvins* questioned by *Vorstius*, *de Justitia Dei*, when he saith, That God in justifying of us, doth *Quodammodo deponere personam judicis*; and the *Arminians* make two distinct, as it were, Thrones of Gods, a *Throne of Grace*, and a *Throne of Justice* (*Lubbert. cont. Bertium*;) and this they do, that so their *non credere* may be accounted of for an universal righteousnesse to Justification: but as you heard, and shall be

manifeſted more (God willing) God doth not pronounce any *righteous*, but he that hath a *perfect righteouſneſſe*; now ſeeing no godly mans righteouſneſſe, much leſſe faith it ſelf, which is but a particular grace, is all the righteouſneſſe we ought to have: Therefore we muſt look out for ſome more perfect and enduring righteouſneſſe then this is; for the preſent take notice, that moſt of the places of Scripture ſpeaking of *Juſtification*, make it a *diſcharging* and *acquitting from accuſations*, and ſo doth legally make juſt, not qualitatively, *Deut.* 25. 1. *Iſa.* 5. 23. *Prov.* 17. 15. And indeed to *juſtifie* a wicked man could not be an abomination to the Lord, if to juſtifie were to make juſt and holy, for this would be acceptable to God.

Thoſe two places often inſtanced in by the Papiſts, are as often anſwered by the Orthodox, *Dan.* 12. 3. *They that are juſtifiers of many*, or as we render it, *That turn many to righteouſneſſe, ſhall be as the ſtarres*, for the Miniſters of the Word do not juſtifie by infuſing holineſſe into their teachers, but by informing and inſtructing of them how to attain to this benefit, and by a declarative application of Gods grace to the humbled, repenting ſinner, in which ſenſe they are ſaid to *remit* and *looſe* ſinne, which is to *juſtifie inſtrumentally*, even as they are ſaid to *regenerate*, 1 Cor. 4. 13. and *ſave*, 1 Tim. 4. 16. inſtrumentally.

The other place is *Revel.* 22. 11. *He that is righteous, let him be righteous*, or juſtified ſtill. Some Divines will indeed grant, that Juſtification taken largely and improperly, may comprehend under it Sanctification alſo, for God never *juſtifieth*, but thoſe he *ſanctifieth*, yet there is no neceſſity to underſtand it ſo here, ſeeing it may only denote, that he who is righteous ſhould abide and continue in the ſtate of Juſtification, *For though holy works do not juſtifie, yet by them a man is continued in a ſtate and condition of Juſtification: ſo that did not the Covenant of Grace interpoſe, groſſe and wicked wayes would cut off our Juſtification, and put us in a ſtate of condemnation.* Let this then be concluded on, That Juſtification is a legal or juridical word; ſo that if men guilty of crimes, eſpecially capical, tremble at thoſe Summons which bring them

before

before the Judge, How much more should we at those sins for which we shall be arraigned at Gods barre? So that if God did not mercifully absolve us through Christ, we must necessarily undergo that eternal doom, which is due unto our sins. VI

Thirdly, *Justification being then an absolution of us, and pronouncing of us righteous, there is necessarily implied thereby, that we are indeed made and constituted righteous*; For seeing God pronounceth a *curse* against him *that justifieth the wicked*, we cannot or must not think, that because God is said to *justifie the ungodly*, Rom. 4. that God doth that which he abhorreth in us; for though the person justified be in himself a sinner, yet at the same time believing in Christ, and putting Christs righteousnesse upon him, he is made a partaker of a perfect righteousnesse, by which he is justified. Hence *Rom.* 5. 19. *By one mans obedience shall many be made righteous*, where by obedience is not meant onely *Christs death*, but his *active conformity to the Law of God*, neither is that expresion to be understood of inherent righteousnesse, as is more largely to be shewed: God then when he pronounceth us righteous, judgeth according to truth; So that in this we need not contest with the Papist, Whether it signifie to make righteous or no; onely we deny it to make righteous inherently, we are truly and really made righteous, but not by a perfect renovation of the whole man in a full conformity to Gods will. This if duely considered might revive the heart of every true believer: He thinketh, How shall I come with my rags into the presence of so glorious and holy a Majesty? How shall I so full of sin and imperfection, come into Gods presence? Is it not as offensive, as it was for those croaking frogs to creep into *Pharaohs* chamber? Oh remember that thou art a just and righteous man, not in thy self, but in Christ, in whom is no blemish! When God beholds his Church in Christ, then he saith, *Cant.* 3. *Thou art all fair, my Beloved, there is no spot in thee*; yet this doth not degenerate into that *Antinomian* position, *That God seeth no sinne in his people, nor doth chastise them for it*, as is to be shewed. III.

Fourthly,

IV. Fourthly, *Seeing that to justifie is to constitute, and to declare or pronounce righteous; therefore in the third place, it signifieth to attribute all those testimonies either real or verbal to a person so justified, as if he were inherently and compleatly righteous.* Thus when God is said to be justified, *Psal.* 51. that is, because he is indeed just and righteous, to acknowledge this in the world, so to speak of him, and so to celebrate all his providences, as one that doth dispense every thing with much wisdom and purity. Thus *Wisdome* is said *to be justified of her children*, Matth. 11. 19. Although learned men much differ about the sense of that place, and give contrary Interpretations. Some understanding the word to signifie reproved and condemned, because Christ was disallowed by the Jews, as the Greek word is used sometime in humane Authours: Howsoever, when a person is made righteous, and so pronounced, then whatsoever promises and priviledges are appointed for righteous persons, he may claim and expect: hence the effects of such a Justification, are such, that none can have but righteous persons, as *Rom.* 5. 1, 2. *Being justified we have peace with God*; and *Ephes.* 3. *We may come boldly to the throne of grace.* There is none *can lay any thing to our charge*: What can be said more of Angels and Saints in Heaven? None can blame them, accuse or condemn them, and this justified persons have in this life; Oh the depth, breadth and length of this glorious mercy! Now the believer, though compassed about with many infirmities, may as boldly walk abroad, and be afraid or ashamed of no nakednesse, no more then *Adam* before his fall: Though it is not upon his doing the Law that he liveth, yet it is upon Christs fulfilling of it: When *Joseph* is discharged out of prison, then he feareth no more arrests, yea he is preferred to the greatest glory and honour that can be in the Court: Why is it that men leave not the thoughts of all other things to be inflated in this freedome? Did they so much esteem a freedome in the City of *Rome*? How much more ought we to be of that *City in Heaven*? for there neither Law, or Conscience, or

Devils,

Devils have any thing to do with us, we are no more under their dominion.

V. Fifthly, *Justification in the Gospel-way doth always suppose some accusation, some charge, and therefore he must have been a sinner that is thus justified.* Indeed the Apostle speaks of a *Justification by works*, as *Rom.* 2. 13. *The doers of the Law shall be justified*; and *Gal.* 2. 16. There he argueth against such a *Justification*, but this is only a *supposed and imagined one*; The presumptuous Jew being confident in his own righteousnesse thought to introduce such an one: for now since man fallen all the Justification that is, proceedeth by pardoning our infirmities, and imputing Christs righteousnesse unto us. Hence *Adam* if he had continued would have been justified, and so the confirmed Angels are, but not in that notion or way as the Scripture-justification is declared to be: for *Adam* and the elect Angels, have no matter or desert of accusation, there was not the least blemish in their natures; Therefore our Justification differs *specifically* from them: yea our *Justification* before God, differs much from a *judicial absolution* in the *Courts of men*, for with them the more faults are pardoned, the lesse is he justified; yea a man that is pardoned, is not said to be justified, but when crimes are charged upon him, and he proveth himself not guilty, then is the Judge said to justifie him. But it is not thus in Gods Court, for there the sinner is arraigned and found guilty, it is too plain he hath transgressed this and that command, he cannot hide it, or cover it: Now then, God by looking upon us through *Christ*, who made himself an *atonement* for our sins, doth absolve and pronounce us *just*: Oh then that believers did understand Gods way better! There is nothing more innate and natural to man, then to be his own self-justifier, still to think, that for the goodnesse of his heart, and the holinesse of his works, he shall be accepted of. The Jews *Rom* 9. 1. whatsoever *Paul* said, yet would *go about to establish their own righteousnesse*. Men may sooner be convinced to part with their sins, then with their seeming righteousnesse in matter of *Justification*; What was it that made *Luther* lie in a very hell so long, that he often wished he had never been a man,

the terrours of sinne were so great upon him? But because he was ignorant of Gods way in justifying. Till a man be thorowly *Evangelized*, he cannot but think, he must go with his full works to God that he may be justified, and till he hath them, he must excruciate and torment himself, as being under daily fears and bondage; so that its one of the difficultest lessons, and that which Christs Scholars in his highest form do only learn, to go out of their holinesse and duties by faith to Christ for righteousnesse, as well as by conversion to turn from their sins to God. Indeed men corrupted in their opinions judge otherwise, as *Castellio lib. de Justic.* he makes this relying on anothers righteousnesse, *viz.* Christs, to be a sweet pleasing thing to flesh and bloud, as if men had rather do this then mortifie any one sin; but as the Sun can never be without light; so neither can this righteousnesse be without true holinesse: So that although many mens mouths are like open sepulchres against this way of Justification, yet it being so clearly discovered in the Scripture, and the Saints recorded to tremble at their own righteousnesse, *lest God should enter into judgement with them* because of it; Therefore all the godly are to look on this, as the Anchor of their souls, as the only City of Refuge, as that they only can live with and die with, without which what was said of *Judas* might be true of every one, *It had been better he had never been born.*

SERM. XIII.

A particular Description of Justification.

ROM. 8. 33.

It is God that Justifieth.

SOme Propositions have been already delivered for the clearing of this necessary and precious Doctrine of Justification, of which we are to say, as God of the Land of *Israel*, *Our eyes and our hearts are to be upon it all the day long*. We shall at this present add more. And

First, *Though Justification be not an infusing of such holiness and righteousness into us, that thereby we are justified, yet this Justification is never without a Sanctification of our natures*: So that this Doctrine gives no just ground for those prophane calumnies *Papists* and others make, as if we held that men, though wallowing in sinne, were justified by God, as if because Christs righteousnesse was imputed to them, there needed no other holinesse at all. Hence do they so much deride this righteousnesse as *putative*; yea *Castalio* (*lib. de Justif.*) mocketh the Orthodox with their putative modesty and putative learning, but this is an impudent slander; for we professe over and over again, That inherent righteousnesse, and imputed are inseparably annexed, neither is the Question, Whether God doth renew us by his Spirit, and sanctifie our natures when he justifieth us? But *Whether this be our Justification?* Even the Papists themselves acknowledge, That besides this Justification and infused righteousnesse they speak of, there is requisite also remission of sinnes, or a judicial absolution, only they make this either *previous* or *concomitant*, VI.

or *subsequent* to our Justification. This then is confessed on all sides, That an inherent godlinesse and holinesse every justified person hath; But the Question is, Whether for this within him he be justified, or for something without him? We say, The righteousnesse of the most eminent person that is, cannot stand in Gods sight, neither can the just God who pronounceth of things as they are, declare that to be a perfect righteousnesse which is not. Now its plain, That all godly men finde and feel imperfections in their most holy things: One would think that one passage, *Psal.* 143. 2. is enough to satisfie all, where *David*, though a man after Gods own heart, yet prayeth, *That God would not enter into judgement with him, because in his sight no man living can be justified.* He doth not say, he himself, but no man living; for, saith *Augustine*, *Vidit totam vitam humanam circumlatrari peccatis suis*, upon *Psal.* 130. If thou markest our iniquities, O Lord, who should stand? Our imperfections and sins are like so many dogs barking about us that we cannot stirre this foot or that foot, but one sinne or other doth immediately open the mouth against us. Though therefore we are possessed of inherent righteousnesse, yet we rest not, or put confidence in this. This *Contarenus* an ingenuous Papist of old, acknowledged saying, *We had no righteousnesse on which we might rest*, niti tanquam re stabili, *but only the righteousnesse of Christ.* But of this more in time.

VII. *Propos.* 2. *As the Scripture speaks of a two-fold righteousnesse and a two-fold rule and covenant: So there is also a two-fold justification.* There is a *righteousnesse of the Law* which is *universal compleat* and *final*, whereby a man is pronounced by God just in himself, and for his works sake; so that its not of free grace, but debt, that he is so accepted of; and there is *a righteousnesse of faith*, or *covenant of grace*, whereby a sinner believing is pronounced righteous, not in himself, but through Christ his Surety, and thereby Salvation is wholly of grace to him. The former kinde of Justification is now a meer *non ens*, there is no such thing but in books, no man living is justified thus inherently and subjectively, and therefore the Apostle in those two Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, where

where Justification is professedly and exactly treated of, doth very powerfully and fervently set himself against that legal Justification, which some corrupt teachers endeavoured to introduce. Now its a very necessary point even for every Christian to know this distinction, for there are but these two ways of Justication possible, the one would have been of *Adam* had he continued in holiness, then his Justification would not have been a judicial acquittance by remission of sin, but an accounting of him just for his inherent and acquired righteousness. But this way of Justification is impossible for man fallen, and yet the heart of man is very prone to this way, as appears by the *Jews* and *Pharisees*, who laboured *to establish their own righteousness*; and by the false Apostles even in the very first age of the Church, you reade, nothing troubled the Church more, then what that was by which we stood justified before God: The false teachers boldly affirming, That it was by the Law, and the righteousness thereof, and by the works we do, *Paul* on the other side zealously opposeth, informing, That our Justification is in pardon of sin and imputation of righteousness, and that no kinde of works, no not of *Abrahams*, though regenerated, do justifie us: If therefore thou art able to distinguish between these two kinde of Justifications, blesse God for this knowledge, and get the spiritual improvement thereof, for they are immediately contrary, and therefore no subject can be justified both these wayes; if it be by works of the Law, then not of faith; if it be by inherency, then not by imputation. Indeed *the righteousness of the Law is fulfilled in us*, as *Paul* speaks, *Rom.* 8. 3. but not by us, we are justified by the righteousness of the Law in Christ our Surety, be satisfied that, but because we were not performers of it in our own persons, therefore its wholly of grace to us, because its altogether without us: Insomuch that some Divines say, We have our Justification and Salvation, by a *Do this and live*, but not in our own persons, but through Christ our Mediator, who did the Law for us. Therefore though our works be every where excluded from Justification, under any notion whatsoever, yet Christs works are necessarily included. As these two Justifications are directly contrary, so there is no way of com-

pounding them together by confusion or mixtion, they being *two kindes* consisting in indivisible, and therefore you cannot by any distinction so unite them that a third way of Justification should be produced; and this is especially to be observed, for that hath been the endeavour of many later writers, to make a compound of Justification of faith and works together, to make a mixt thing of these two; That whereas the Apostle doth make them immediately contrary, *If of works, then not of faith*, and the believer and the works are alwayes opposed as incompatible, and without this immediate opposition, the Apostles arguments would fall to the ground, they will *Dare tertium*, and finde out some expedient to reconcile those things which the Apostle makes so extreamly distant. As the Papist, We are not justified by works, that is, say they, as opposed to Christs death, and his Spirit, but if they be the works of grace, and the Spirit of God, if *tincta sanguine Christi*, then so we are justified. The *Socinians* and others say, though upon different principles, We are not justified by the workes of the Law, but by the works of the Gospel, or by works in an Evangelical consideration, so that they be not judged meritorious, or that they obtain Salvation by way of debt, but as conditions required by the Gospel, thus they and faith justifie. But all this mincing and palliating will not hold; The Apostle gives no *medium* between believing and working, all kinde of working *quà* working, is immediately opposed to believing; so that *faith* as it is a work is excluded from our Justification. But of this more in time, its enough for the present that we are to apprehend these two kinds of Justification as immediately *contrary*, and by no subtil distinctions in the world can be united together.

VIII. *Prop.* 3. That we may understand all the essentials ingredient to this glorious priviledge of our Justification, we may take this large and popular description of it; *Justification is a gracious and just act of God, whereby through Christ our Mediator and Surety, a sinner but repenting and believing is pronounced just, and thereby put into a state of reconciliation and favour with God, to the praise of Gods glorious Attributes, and to the believers*

vers eternal Salvation. I shall not examine this description by accurate logical rules, its enough that it is comprehensive of every thing requisite to the knowledge of Justification. And

First, We call it an *action*, for so God as a just and merciful Judge is considered in this matter, pronouncing of such as are free from all curses, and also just and righteous. Justification is not properly the sentence or judgement whereby we are pronounced righteous, but its Gods action: Now whether it be an *immanent action*, and so from all *eternity*, or *transient*, accomplished in *time*, I have elsewhere discussed (*Treatise of Justif.*) and there concluded, *That its not immanent nor from eternity, but passing upon a believer in time.* Indeed the Schoolmen darken the dispute about *immanent* and *transient actions*, that its hard to say from them, what is either so or so; for who would not without al doubt conclude, that the Creation of the world is a *transient action*, and yet they hotly quarrel about that, some affirming, and some denying at least in some sense.

Justification an action.

Justification not an immanent but a transient.

Let us therefore lay aside the distinction of *immanent* and *transient*, and plainly say, *God doth not from eternity justifie us, no more then sanctifie or glorifie, but when a man believeth, then, and not before is he justified*, as I have at large proved in the mentioned place. Its an *action of God*, therefore in the Text its said, *God doth justifie*, for seeing that sinne is onely committed against him, and its an offence to his Majesty, and a transgression of his Law; therefore the Scripture attributeth it to *God* only; and indeed though all the men in the world, and our own consciences do acquit us, yet while God doth not justifie we remain unavoidably miserable. Now when we say, *God justifieth*, that is to be understood of the *three Persons in the Godhead*; the *Father justifieth*, and the *Son justifieth*, so doth the *holy Ghost*. Though the Scripture observeth the peculiar *oeconomy* and order, and therefore Justification is attributed to the *Father*, and the merit of it to the *Son*, and the application of it to the *holy Ghost*. The *Socinians*, they say, *Christ justifieth only instrumentally, not principally, even as faith is said to save.* Socin. *apud Steg. p.* 510. but this cannot be, because Christ is God as well as man, and therefore cannot be instrumental, but principal. Hence *Isa.* 53. it is said, *Christ* even as Gods *righteous*

Its an action of God.

servant,

servant, which is in respect of his *Mediatory Office should justifie many*. Again *Rom.*5. *Christ* and the *first Adam* are compared and opposed, as the two heads, one of *condemnation*; the other of *Justification to life*; so that as *Adam* was the principal in reference to *death* and *judgement*, so *Christ* is the *fountain* of *life and righteousnesse*. Furthermore, *Christ is the directing and efficient cause of all organical and instrumental causes in our Justification*, as *faith*, which is *mans instrument*, Christ is the cause of it, *Luk.*17.5. So Christ is the cause of the *Ministry*, and the spiritual success of it, *Eph.*4.11,12. And hence it is that he is called, *The Sun of righteousnesse*, Mal.5.2. *The true light*, Joh.1.9. *The King of righteousnesse*, Heb.7.2. All which comparisons do plainly demonstrate, That Christ is *principal*, and not *instrumental*.

A gracious action of God.

In the description we say, Its the *gracious action of God*, for there is nothing did *move God*, but his *own meer favour*; Therefore its said, *Rom.*3. *freely by his grace*; Gods mercy and mans misery do illustrate one another, though it were of *Justice* to Christ, yet wholly of *grace* to us; and therefore if thou art justified, when many thousands lie in a wretched, condemned estate: Oh what enlargements of heart should there be to free grace! Shall the malefactor freed from his prison and condemnation so rejoyce? how much then should justified persons glorifie God, who are thereby delivered from the curse of the Law, and not only so, but advanced to all honour and glory! Abhor all *Popish doctrines of Satisfaction or compensations* to God; flie from all *presumptuous doctrines* that advance *free-will*, or affirm *preparatory merits* to our *Justification*! Sooner may we finde stars in the bottom of the earth, then any merit in us of our acceptance with God.

By or through Christ our Mediator or Surety.

Further in the description it followeth [*By or through Christ our Mediator and Surety.*] This is the *meritorious cause* of Justification; for *Christs obedience and death*, is both the *meritorious* and *material cause of our Justification*, *meritorious* as *antecedent to our application*, and *the material cause as applied and received by us*. Justification then, though it be free and of meer grace, yet it is also of Justice, and therefore the *throne of Gods grace*, and of his *Justice*, while he justifieth us, is all one,

one, and this doth not only oppose the *Socinian blasphemy* denying Christs *merit* and *satisfaction*, but that corrupt position also, which affirmeth, *That Christ died so, that our imperfect righteousness and faith, may be accepted of as perfect*; As if Evangelical righteousness whereby we are justified, were our own personal righteousness: And if it be objected, Ours is imperfect, drossie and corrupt; They answer, Christ by his death did procure such a Gospel-dispensation, that that which in it self is imperfect, should through Gods gracious esteem be accounted of as perfect; but *this is to make God Judge, and esteem of things otherwise then they are, and to make Christ die, if not for the abrogating of the Law totally as a rule, yet gradually, that it shall not require so much as it did before*; But whatsoever the Law required before *Christs death*, it doth still as *effectually* and as *powerfully* as ever, and no righteousness can justifie us, but what is *universal*, and every way commensurated to the rule. So that as against the former *heresie*, we say, God did not pardon sin, as some great Kings of the world use to do at the instant Petition of some Favourite; so neither against the *later errour* do we say, That Christ by his death hath obtained that half the debt should be accounted as the whole, or whereas the debt was to be paid in gold, it should now suffice if it be paid in lead, or some other baser metal.

A sinner repenting and believing.

The next thing in the description is *a sinner repenting and believing*; a sinner, therefore he that is perfectly righteous cannot be partaker of an *Evangelical Justification*; This should inform the godly, that they are not with diffidence and distrust to be cast down, when they feel the reliques of corruption still moving in them; whensoever they assay to go, they finde some pain and stiffnesse, much unbelief, pride, and many worldly cares do hinder and trouble them: Oh refresh thy self with the nature of this Justification! If thou were not a sinner thou didst not need a Justification, if thou wert not undone in thy self, thou didst not want a Saviour, if there were no corruption in thee, there would be no need of a Christ. Thus the Apostle *Rom.* 4. 3. *He justifieth the ungodly*; now this Justification doth not only reach to *sins against the Law*, but *against the Gospel*; it sounds as intolerable Doctrine

in my ears, That Christ our Mediator did only expiate by his death sins against the Law and Covenant of works, but that those that are against the *Covenant of grace*, even our faith as justifying and repentance, which are not duties known by the Law, or consistent with it, have their imperfections in them, and do deserve eternal damnation, and therefore our Mediator stands obliged by his office, to atone for the sins that are in the second Covenant as well as in the first.

A sinner but repenting.

In the description of the object, we adde, *a sinner, but repenting*, and this is to exclude all *Antinomian poison*, as if a person abiding in his sins, and while persisting in his rebellions, were partaker of this glorious priviledge: this cannot be, because remission of sin, which is a great part of our Justification, is alwayes by the Scripture promised to such as *humble themselves, and repent of their iniquities*, till there be humiliation, there is no forgivenesse, as I have in the former Treatise at large proved. Therefore that is a foul slander of *Grotius* against the *Orthodox* (*Votopacis pag.* 115.) that with us, it were enough to say to the most wretched sinner that liveth, Do but believe this, *that thy sins are forgiven*, and there is nothing more required to thy salvation, *cum hac viatica evolat in Cœlum*: With what fore-head could he charge this upon the Protestant Doctrine, who had read many of their writings? But there cannot come honey from a *Serpent*. We say, there is no aptitude or fitnesse, yea there is an absolute contrariety in a sinner to Justification, till he do repent. But repenting is not all, it must be a *sinner repenting and believing*.

Believing:

This corrective must be to our repentance, else our tears will be of the fountain *Marah*, only this you must diligently attend unto, that *repentance* is not an ingredient to our Justification, as *faith* is, *Repentance qualifieth the subject, but faith immediately receiveth it*. Repentance is not an instrument receiving Christ, as faith doth. Its not therefore a justifying repentance, as we call it a justifying faith: Hence the Scripture useth a peculiar appropriated expression of faith, *Justified by faith*, and remission of sins is *received by faith in his blood*, which is never attributed to any other grace. Therefore that is unsound doctrine which excludeth faith from a peculiar instru-

instrumentality in our Justification, making faith and obedience to be the conditions of our Justification, and that they do both alike justifie, only faith is granted to have some kinde of principality: But this is directly to be confuted, when we come to shew negatively, *what is not that righteousnesse by which we stand justified.*

In the description followeth the very formal and essential nature, wherein this Justification doth consist, and that is in *pronouncing just.* Now this doth contain in it two things; *Remission of sins*, and *Imputation of Christs righteousnesse.* It's true in this later, There is great dispute amongst the *Orthodox*; some denying wholly the imputed obedience of Christ, as actively considered: But that is in its due place to be largely maintained, neither may we, if we attend to Scripture, or to the nature of Justification, think that it is wholly comprehended in pardon of sin; I have at large in my former Treatise discussed *the nature of the pardon of sin.* Its my main scope in this Book to handle the doctrine of *imputed righteousnesse*, of which fully, as my method proposed, will conduct me to it. The consequent of this Justification followeth in the description, That hereby the person justified is *imputed into Gods favour.* Some make reconciliation an *antecedent*, some a *part* of Justification, but it seemeth more properly to be the *effect* of it; for when once justified, then the great gulf between God and us is removed; Then when God and man are agreed, they may walk together, and we have fellowship with him, and this is not to be conceived in the way of some *transient actions that passe away*, and leave not so much as a *relative change.* No, for when God doth justifie us at first, we are upon our believing put into a *state and a fixed condition of peace with God.* Thus the Scripture speaks of it as a state, like that of Sanctification and Glorification; so that while we are *sleeping* we are justified, because put into that estate, although we do not then actually believe. The *first act* therefore of *faith* receiving Christ in whom we are justified, is like the putting of one into a *state of marriage*, or of *Magistracy*: Though the first act passe away, yet the *relative change* it hath made continueth alwayes; We are not justified by the *habit*

Is pronounced just.

of faith, but by the *act*, and yet after the first act we stand justified, though we are not all the day long actually believing. Its true, many learned Divines say, Justification is a continued action, and it may be granted in this sense, that God doth daily justifie believers, even as he constantly preserveth them in their natural being; but it is not true in this sense, as if we were put into a new state of Justification every day. This is not only to make a first and a second Justification, but a thousand Justifications; remission of sins and imputation of Christs righteousnesse are reiterated; but Justification besides these doth connote a fixed estate of the justified person, which is but once, and the Mediator of the Covenant of grace doth so firmly uphold this privilledge, that there shall never be any *total intercision of it*, neither do ever any *plenarily apostatize* from this wonderful favour, that once received it. Lastly, There is the end of this Justification, which is two-fold, on Gods part, and on the believers part. On Gods part it is, *That the glorious Attributes of God*, especially his Wisdome, Grace and Justice may be magnified; and certainly all these are more seen in the Justification of a sinner, then in the creating of the world, or in the most eminent mercies and deliverances the Church ever had: And on the believers part, it is for his infinite comfort here, and his eternal happinesse hereafter: So that our Justification is the beginning of heaven here upon the earth; we can have no more right to heaven hereafter, then Justification doth for the present entitle us unto, only we shall have a full possession, which as yet we want. No wonder then if *Paul* say, *Rom.* 5. *Being justified by faith we have peace with God, yea and glory in tribulations, rejoycing with joy unspeakable.*

Serm. XIV.

More Propositions tending to clear the Nature of Justification, especially shewing how it answers all Accusations.

Rom. 8. 33.

It is God that Justifieth.

WHat the Scripture saith, *Deut.* 24. 15. of the poor man, *That his hire is not to be detained from him, no not for a day, because his heart is set on it,* Its all he hath to live upon; The same is much more to be applied of that person, who is spiritually poor and sensible of his great debt through sinne: The Doctrine of Justification is not for a day or an hour to slip out of his minde, for his heart is set on it. Its all the comfort, and all the hope he hath, if that go all goeth: So that the excellency and necessity of the point being so great, I shall not withhold any thing that may serve for the clear discovery of it. I shall therefore adde more Propositions to the former. And

IX. The first is, *That though Justification be properly attributed to a sinner believing, yet the Scripture speaks of Christs Justification, not as if Christ repented for us, or believed for us, as some have absurdly affirmed.* Saltmarsh. For as Christ had no personal sinne, so neither could he have such a personal repentance, or justifying faith. Besides, by this Assertion

Christ should have relied upon himself, as a Mediatour, and so have been justified by faith in his own blood. But the Scripture speaks of Christs Justification to another purpose, 1 Tim. 3. 16. where it is called a *great mystery, God manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit*; yea this expression in the Text, *Its God that justifieth*, seemeth to be taken from *Isa.* 50. 8. *He is near that justifieth me, who will contend with me?* So that what is there said of Christ, the Apostle doth apply to every believer. Now there are learned men speak of Christs Justification two wayes: Some say, That as Christ took our sins upon him, and so was under Gods displeasure, bearing the wrath due unto us; so likewise it was necessary he should have a Justification, not for any sinne of his own, but as a common person, and our Surety and Head: Insomuch that Christ upon his Resurrection (they say) having consummated the work of our Redemption, was then justified by the Father, and absolved from all the sins of the elect, which were charged upon him; and thus they grant a *virtual Justification* in Christ, as we are said to be *risen with him, and to sit in heavenly places with him*, before there be an actual Justification by faith; and this they make the reason, why that which the Prophet spake of Christ, the Apostle applyeth to every believer, because Christ is the common person, they are looked upon in him, and none may accuse them, but he must accuse Christ first; but the Scripture seemeth not to be clear for this, unlesse we mean that Christ merited our Justification, and so we were virtually justified in him, because he obtained the right of our Justification, which was in time to be applied to us: Neither is there any ground to fasten such a Justification upon Christ, because our sins were not so laid upon him, or imputed to him, as to denominate him a sinner. Its true, his righteousnesse is made over to us, so as that thereby we are constituted and accounted of as righteous, but our sins are not in the same manner laid upon him; and the reason of this difference is, because our sins were *imputed to him*, for him *to bear away*, to take away the guilt of them, they were *not to abide on him*. But Christs righteousnesse is made ours, to abide and continue ours, and therefore we

Whether Christ was or did need to be justified.

Reasons against it.

are

are denominated righteous, but not Christ a sinner, though its true in a large sense. *Luther* said, *Christ was the greatest of all sinners*, but his meaning not his words must be regarded. If therefore there was not such an imputation of sinne unto Christ, as our Surety, in the sense mentioned, then there needed not such a justification of him, as a common person. And as for that Text, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. *Justified in the Spirit*, by the Spirit, is meant, as most Divines acknowledge, the Divine Nature of Christ, whereby he raised up himself, as *Heb.* 9. 14. he is said to have *offered up himself by the eternal Spirit*, which was his Divine Nature; so that he was justified by raising up himself; that whereas his enemies had accused him for an impostor, for a false prophet, for one that wrought by the devil, and therefore justly suffered such an ignominious end, now he being raised again by his own power, he was justified against all those calumnies that were cast on him, and this seemeth to be the most genuine exposition.

X. Justification extends as far as accusation and condemnation.

Propos. 2. *This Justification of the believer extends as farre as his accusation and condemnation might have reached.* I make Justification to oppose both accusation and condemnation, not mattering *Stapletons* cavil on this Text, quarrelling with *Calvin* and *Beza*, because its opposed onely to accusation, and that in the next verse Christs death is opposed to our condemnation, for one is but the antecedent, the other the consequent, and Justification taking away the former, must needs remove the later; wheresoever then any accusation may be made against a sinner believing, there we are to conceive our Justification freeing of us. Now our accusation may arise several wayes:

Accusations. 1. From God.

1. *There is the Justice of God accusing and arraigning of us, because we have not in the least manner perfectly observed his Law.* Therefore that cals for the due punishment belonging to us; for to every sinner we may say the clean contrary in the Text, before he doth believe, Who shall say any thing to free or excuse him that is ungodly? Its God that accuseth and its God that condemneth. Our Justification therefore in the first place doth absolve us from all that God the Judge

of the world hath against us. Hence Justification doth still respect to Gods sight, and to Gods account, *Psal.* 143.2. *In thy sight shall no man living be justified.* The world may justifie us, our own hearts may absolve us, but God who is greater then our hearts, he may condemn us. Thus *Rom.* 5.1. *Being justified, we have peace with God*; so that the primary and chief thing in Justification, is to remove that enmity between God and us; we were *stubble* and he a *consuming fire*; we were *darkness*, and he *light*: Now by Justification all this contrariety and distance is taken away; this then is the original and source of all happinesse, our reconciliation begins with God first: As the waters of the Sea can never lie still while the windes blow upon them; so the heart of man can never have any true quietnesse, while God doth frown on him. *If the anger of a King be like the roaring of a Lion*, how dreadfull is the anger of God? The sense of this made *David* so often pray for the *light of Gods countenance*, as without which no kingdoms, no successe or earthly greatnesse can make him happy.

2. From the Law

In the second place; *The Law that doth accuse him for a cursed is every one that fulfilleth not that is every jota.* The Apostle in his Epistle to the *Galatians* at large sheweth, there cannot come any Justification by the Law; there is nothing but a curse and execration by that. Therefore *Rom.* 7. though of it self it were appointed for life, yet accidentally through our corruption it is made a *killing* and a *damning Law*; sinne hath a sharp and bitter sting, but it's the Law that puts this into it. Now when we are justified, the Scriptures in many places deny us to be under the Law, *Rom.* 6.14. *Rom.* 7.6. Not that they are exempted from the regulating power of the Law, God himself cannot free them from obedience to that, no more then he can make them not to be his servants or creatures, or then he can deny himself the just titles and rights which belong to him, as God, but only from the malediction and curse of the Law; The Law cannot now implead us for the breach of it, because we are found in the righteousnesse of Christ, *The impossibility of the Law* as to us, *is fulfilled in Christ*, our Justification then freeth us in this Court.

3. *Our*

3. *Our accusation may be from the Devil, for he is called, The Accuser of the Brethren to God*, as we see he complained of the high-Priests garments, *Zech.* 3. 1, 2. *Satan stood at Gods right hand to resist him*, and had we not a constant accuser of us to God, what need would there be of an *Advocate with the Father* in heaven to plead our cause? 1 *John* 2. 2. The Devil then he inditeth thee for all those sins and infirmities thou art guilty of, he requireth thee as his own, he challengeth thee as a fire-brand for hell: But our Justification that absolveth us here also, that stops his mouth. Being in Christ he can no more accuse us, then Christ himself: Therefore Christ died to *judge the Devil, who was the Prince of the world*, to cast him out, and to dissolve his works, *John* 12. 31. *John* 16. 11. 1 *John* 3. 8. Insomuch that when the Devil comes he cannot finde any condemnation for thee, who art in Jesus Christ. 3. From the Devil.

4. *A man is accused from his own Conscience*, as *Rom.* 7. you see *Paul* from the sense of sinne within him, crying out, *Oh miserable man that I am! who shall deliver me?* And *David*, Psal. 19. *Who can understand his errours?* He hath more corruption in him then he can finde out. This is that which is as good as a thousand witnesses, yea an whole world against us, and our Justification doth remove this inditement also, sereneth and quiets the conscience, so that *Rom.* 5. *We have peace with God, and rejoyce with joy unspeakable*: Insomuch that some Divines make Justification properly to lie in this, when the heart of a man being terrified and broken for sinne doth receive this Justification, and by the sense or perswasion thereof, is filled with much joy and peace, but though eminent Divines say thus, yet its hard to affirm it as truth, for there is a great deal of difference between our Justification and the sense of it. Many may be justified, and yet not think so, or know so. Justification and the certain perswasion of it are separable; we see *David*, though a *childe of light*, yet walking sometimes in *darknesse*. Therefore our Justification doth not consist in our apprehension of it, for that doth necessarily suppose it to *antecede*, and the act doth follow the object, except when its causative and constitutive of it. But it is not so here, our 4. From ones own conscience.

our Justification is received by faith, but then the reflex act, or the souls knowledge, that it is justified, followeth after, and that differently; in some it followeth immediately, in others its detained a long while; yea a godly man, though greatly in the favour of God, may (for ought I know) live and die in the sense of the want of it; for the perswasion and inward sense of our Justification is not essential to Salvation; neither doth the Scripture require it as a necessary ingredient to our happinesse. Indeed to believe is necessary to Justification and Salvation, but to know, or to be assured that we do believe, is not. But though our Justification doth not necessarily and inseparably cause such peace and consolation in the soul, yet in its nature it doth encline to it: As the Sunne doth to cast its beams abroad, though an eclipse may obstruct and hinder it: and no wonder these emanations of Justification may be intercepted, since in Christ himself, who was truly God, the sense of consolation was for a while stopped, and did not diffuse it self from the Divine Nature to the humane. That Spirit of God spoken of *Rom.* 8.15. *Gal.* 4.6. which is sent forth in our hearts, *whereby we cry Abba, Father*, is not in the act of our Justification, but consequent upon it, for God must be our Father, and reconciled with us before we can call him Father. By all this it appears, that our Justification is not only *in foro Dei*, but *in foro conscientiæ* also; and indeed our consolation floweth from the later. Though God justifieth us, yet till we feel and know this, we may walk as uncomfortably, as if not justified at all. *Mary Magdalen* had her sins forgiven her, before Christ particularly spake to her, *Be of good comfort thy sins be forgiven*; but when this was particularly applied to her, then she did rejoyce with all fulnesse of joy.

5. From men.

5. *Our Justification doth extend even to all those accusations that we have from Men.* Great are the calumnies that are laid upon the godly, as hypocrites, deceivers, and the worst of men. Now when God justifieth, he cancelleth all these accusations. *Grotius* on the Text, following the *Remonstrants*, speaks as if the accusation and condemnation here spoken of, to which Justification is opposed, did consist in this only: for

he

he mentioneth no other, Who shall accuse and lay any thing to their charge, when God justifieth? But though this be included, yet its the least considerable in our Justification. Therefore when the children of God are slandered, reproached, and men speak all manner of evil of them without cause; they may comfort themselves from their Justification, God layeth no such thing to their charge, God looks not upon them as thus and thus, but they are through Christ accepted and beloved. Thus you see that Justification doth reach as far as our accusation. Its not a covering too narrow for all thy nakednesse, Christs robes will hide thee when fig-leaves cannot.

Whether Gods act of justifying be only his grant of it in the Gospel.

Its asserted, That Justification call'd *in titulo*, or virtual, is nothing but the grant of it in the Gospel; but I see not how that can be called our Justification, its the sign or instrument declaring of it, not Justification it self, as the grant or promise of our Sanctification is not our Sanctification; and as on the contrary our condemnation while we abide in sin, or Gods anger against the sinner is not the threatning promulged, but that which comes from God himself; neither then could we say, that we are justified by Christ given unto us, but by the Proposition laid down in the Scripture, whereas all say, that the *objectum quod* of our faith is *ens incomplexum*, not the promise of Christ, but Christ himself promised. Besides *Abraham* was justified, and he is made the patern of all that shall be justified, yet there was no Scripture grant, or deed of gift in writing, declaring this; God then communicating himself to beleevers in an immediate manner; Therefore to call this grant or conditional promise in the Scripture [*Whosoever shall believe shall be justified*] a transient act of God, is very unproper, unlesse in such a sense, as we say, Such a mans writing is his hand, and that is wholly impertinent to our purpose.

XI.

Thirdly, *This Justification of us is not necessary at first onely, while we are coming out of our sinne, but in the whole progresse of our Sanctification.* Its true, some Divines say, that Justification is compleated and *perfected at one instant*, when we *first believed*. Others, they say, its a *continued action*, and happily both may be reconciled: for take Justification as it con-

noteth a *state* we are put into, so its not iterated, but done once; neither are we put again and again, or daily in the state of Justification, no more then God doth daily create the world. But if we take Justification for the *particular acts* of it, *remitting of sin*, and *imputing of Christs righteousnesse*, then these are daily and continually performed: Even as in our natural life, though we be not daily created, yet we need a constant preservation in that life we were created in. Thus it is here, God out of his meer grace did upon our believing put us into a state of Justification, from which favour we should fall every moment, did not God continue us therein. Hence in the Text its ὁ δικαιῶν God that is continually justifying of us; if we speak of Sanctification as a *state*, we cannot say that is reiterated, that the godly are frequently sanctified in that sense; but if Sanctification be taken for the *particular acts* of Gods grace, exciting, corroborating, quickning, and the like; these are as daily necessary as our daily bread; thus it is in our Justification, we need a *constant remission*, we want a *perpetual imputation*, because our sins and imperfections are renewed daily.

XII. Fourthly, *Our Justification is full and adequate to every purpose in this life.* The Scripture speaks of it as a priviledge, that we are now made partakers thereof; for while we consider how great and glorious an honour and happinesse it is, we may think this is too great to be had in this life, Angels and glorified Saints can have no more: but be not discouraged, God even in this life, though full of rags and ulcers, doth pronounce us just through Christ, and deal with us as just, *Rom.* 3.24. *Being justified freely by his grace*; we have it already, we may for the present make a comfortable improvement of it, and *Rom.*5.9. *Being now justified by his blood*; Now its already done for us, and so 1 *Cor.*6.11. *Ye are justified, ye are sanctified*, the one was then done for them as well as the other. Hence *Rom.*4.5. *Its God that justifieth the ungodly* in the present tense. If therefore we walk not as justified persons, its our ignorance and unskilfulnesse in these great things. Its true at the day of judgement there will be a solemn and more compleat justifying of us, as I have elsewhere shewed, yet that Justification

spoken

spoken of so much by *Paul* in his Epistles, doth belong to this life; and indeed we cannot then be said to be justified by faith, for justifying faith in that act, as well as repentance will then cease, every thing that implieth an imperfection in the subject being then abolished; or if we be then justified, *i.e.* declare justified in an Evangelical sense, it will be, because we did in this life believe in Christ, because we once had justifying faith. Hence this kinde of Justification will cease in heaven, though the praise and glory for it will ever redound to Christ. It is thought that the Union between Christ and his Church shall never cease, but the manner of application of it on our part, and communication of it on Gods part by Ordinances shall not then continue. Though therefore at the day of judgement, we shall have a more publick and solemn Justification before God, Angels and men, in which sense it may be said, We are not completely and perfectly justified till then; yet that relateth most to what was in our lives past, not to what we shall be then, seeing at that time the spirits of just men are made perfect, and their bodies crowned with immortality and glory.

Propos. 5. *In a well explained sense, that Proposition is true of our Divines, that all believers are justified alike,* The meanest woman believing, though the greatest sinner, a *Mary Magdalen*, as much as the Virgin *Mary*. This indeed is thought blasphemous Doctrine in *Popery*, because they confound Justification and Sanctification, and therefore are necessitated to admit of Degrees, one being more holy then another: but with the Orthodox, Justification is without us, and consists in the favour of God, who looking upon us through Christ, doth justifie from great sins as well as little sins, one sinner is as easily justified as another, and alike justified: yet understand this in a sound sense; for though there be no difficulty with God in pardoning great sins as well as little, and Justification like the sea can drown the tallest *Ægyptian*, as well as a little childe; yet more is required of a greater sinner then of a lesse in the way to Justification. Crimson sins must have greater sorrow; sins of daily incursion require not such a solemn repentance, as those that waste the conscience; though when XIII.

sincerely repenting, the believer is not to doubt of the pardon of great sins, because great. Though to God Justification from all sins be as easie as from one, and from great sins as well as lesse, yet our repentance is to be drawn out according to the nature of our sins, although it must be acknowledged, that the least sinne being against such an infinite Majesty, deserveth our most intensive sorrow, and could we be melted into rivers of tears, yet they could not wash away the least spot of sinne. Again, Though all are equally justified, that is to be understood *intensivè*, as they say, not *extensivè*, that is, though all justified persons have those priviledges which accompany Justification, they have peace with God, they have a right to heaven and happinesse; yet he that hath more sins pardoned then another, and so hath Christs righteousnesse to cover more imperfections then another, he may be said extensively to be justified more then another is, though he hath not the full and compleat mercy of Justification, more then he that hath sinned lesse. As a Gyant that hath six fingers and six toes, and is vaster in body, hath not a bigger soul (for according to some Philosophers, All souls are essentially equal) then a lesse man, only the operation and virtue of it may diffuse it self more extensively.

XIV. Lastly, *This is not to be understood so, as if faith, which is the applying means of our Justification, may not be firmer in some then in others.* For no doubt some have a strong faith, some have a weak faith, and so some apprehend their Justification more stedfastly then others, yet because the worth and merit of our Justification is not in the degree of our faith, but in Christs righteousnesse apprehended by it; therefore the weak Christian is as compleatly and perfectly justified as the stronger. This, if duly considered, may establish and revive the drooping Christian, who because he hath lesse grace, therefore thinketh he hath lesse Justification: No, this is to say, thou hast a lesse Christ then *Paul* or *David* had. Though there be difference in your Sanctification, yet not in your Justification.

SERM. XV.

The several Distinctions of Learned Men in the Point of Justification.

ROM. 8. 33.

It is God that Justifieth.

THere remain two Propositions more that will clear this fundamental Doctrine of Justification.

XV. No inconveniency in granting the form of our justification to be two-fold.

The first is, *That there is no absurdity or inconveniency in granting that the form or nature of our Justification is two-fold, or consists in two things.* *Bellarmine lib.* 1. *de Justific.* endeavours to fasten it upon the Protestants, that they make Justification to have a *two-fold form, viz.* Remission of sinne and imputation of righteousnesse, although at the same time he reckons up four different opinions (as he cals them) amongst the Protestants. Our Divines generally in their answer strive to make Justification to consist in one simple form, and so endeavour a reconciliation between those four opinions, making them to be only different expressions, especially *Parem. Castigat. Bellar.* and *Vorstius Antibellar. de Justif.* with others, make *remission of sinne* and *imputation of righteousnesse* to be the same thing, expressed onely from different terms or extreams: Even as the expulsion of darknesse, and introduction of light, are the same motion. I shall not here consider the truth of this Assertion, only I may affirm, That there is no errour or

inconvenience, to make Justification to consist in two distinct benefits, which may be called a *double form*, for pardon of sinne, and imputation of Christs righteousnesse, are (as is to be shewed) two real distinct mercies, both compleating our Justification. Indeed to assert a two-fold form of Justification that is *heretogeneall* and opposite to one another, as our learned Writers charge the Councel of *Trent* with, though that speaks ambiguously and subtilly, *viz.* in remission of sin and infusion of righteousnesse; this we say is very absurd and erroneous; for how can the righteousnesse inherent in us, be a form of Justification, which is an action of God? Its irrational to affirm any such thing; but if the two-fold form be *homogeneous*, of the same kinde, both actions of God without us, then I see no cause so much to strive against such a doctrine, and the *Scripture* doth plainly speak of both these parts, *remission of sinne*, and *imputation of righteousnesse*, and that not as the same thing, but of one as the ground of the other: sinne is pardoned, because righteousnesse is imputed, and certainly imputation of righteousnesse is the more noble part of Justification, and that which is more immediately constitutive of it: Insomuch that some learned Divines make remission of sinne not of the formal nature of Justification, but an effect or consequent of it: but that seemeth not so consonant to Scripture. Now the ground why its no absurdity to make Justification to consist in two distinct mercies, is *Because this is wholly a gracious favour of God*, and therefore takes in as many ingredients as he pleaseth to appoint: So that the form of Justification, is not like the forms of natural things, that consist *in indivisibili*, but like any moral or civil forms, which by Law many times require several actions to the constitution of them: So that if we would judge of the nature of Justification, we must not examine it by naturall motions, such as the expulsion of darknesse or coldnesse, and the introduction of light or heat, but rather compare it with civil grants of liberty and favour, that the supream Magistrate sometimes bestoweth, which may consist of several branches, and many particular priviledges, whereof one is really distinct from the other.

Propos.

XVI. The reality of justification by imputation.

Propos. 2. This priviledge of Justification is a real, efficacious priviledge in all those effects it is appointed for. Let the Adversary calumniate never so boldly, yet in this truth *nihil haerebit*. This viper cannot fasten on this Doctrine, *That Justification is nothing according to the Protestants Doctrine, but a meer putative figment, that it is a meer Chimara.* For first, *Its remission of sinne*, which they themselves acknowledge to be by the Satisfaction of Christ, Is that a meer figment? Is it such a meer fancy and notion to say, Christs death and his sufferings are imputed to us, so that Gods justice is satisfied more then if we had suffered in our own persons? If then this be no fiction or putative fancy, Why is the righteousnesse of Christ imputed to us? Besides, to call this a meer figment, is likewise to destroy many civil Covenants and acceptilations in Law; Do not the civil Laws of a Magistrate give a real being for many actions which are meerly by imputation? As when a Surety bound for a debtor dischargeth the debt, Is not the debtor by Law acquitted, as if he had done it in his own person? Yea private men may by their imputation give a reality to some actions: When *Paul* wrote to *Philemon*, that he should charge *Onesimus* his wrongs and debts upon him, if *Philemon* voluntarily did this, and for *Pauls* sake accounted all as discharged, had not here been a real discharge of *Onesimus*? How much more then must this hold between God and us, through *Christ* our *Surety* and *Mediator*. For

1. Here is a real giving of Christ with all his benefits to us: As *Christ really* died, *really* fulfilled the Law, and suffered the punishment of sin due to us, so this as *really* given to us and made ours, unlesse we will say, that *justifying faith* is but a meer *fancy*, or a *non-entity*.

2. *There is Gods judging and accounting this Obedience and Satisfaction for us as ours.* Now Gods judgement is alwayes according to truth, what he accounts to another must needs be so. Hence is the phrase *Rom.* 4. of imputing righteousnesse; Gods judgement, and imputing of this as ours, makes it a real thing. Hence by this God is said to be *reconciled*, to *forgive*, to be *well-pleased*, all which argue reality.

3. *There is a real grace on our part, which doth receive this righteousnesse*

righteousnesse offered, and that is often said to be *by faith in his blood*; Now this faith is a most real thing, for *Heb.* 11. 1. its called ὑπόστασις, *The substance of things hoped for*; its called *hungring and thirsting*, its called *coming to Christ*, yea its said to be *eating of his flesh, and drinking of his blood*: So that even the whole life of a godly man is attributed to this *faith*; yea *Paul*, Gal. 2. makes his natural life to be nothing to this, *I no longer live, but Christ in me, and the life I live is by faith in Christ*. Therefore we are sooner to conclude, that our eating, our drinking, our natural life, are *non*-entities, then this receiving of Christs righteousnesse.

Lastly, *The effects of this Justification are real, and they are the choicest food or refreshment of a Christian*, for hereby *we have peace with God*, we are made *blessed*, we have *boldnesse at the throne of grace*, we can *glory in all tribulations*. Although therefore *Logicians* say, That relation is the least degree of *entity*, yet this *relative change* by our *Justification* is of admirable *virtue* and *efficacy*, yea we are to rejoyce in it, as if it were the most *physical* or *natural transmutation* that can be imagined; It is a *relative change*, which hath a real *fundamentum*, and a real *terminus*, as *Chemnitius* well sheweth, though *Bellarmine* very superciliously derideth it, as ridiculous *Logick*.

The distinctions of learned men about justification.

Having thus laid down the most material things that clear this truth, let us consider what *Distinctions* sound or unsound that are given by learned men in this point, that so we may receive the gold, and reject the drosse, separating the precious from the vile.

And first, *Some speak of a Justification active, and a Justification passive*, not that they are two *species* or kindes of Justification, but onely the same the same thing considered as coming from *God*, is called *active Justification*; and the same as received or applied by the believer, is *passive Justification*. As the Schoolmen distinguish of a *Creatio activa* and *passiva*, making *Creatio passiva* to be the creature it self: now this distinction hath its use, for when we say, Faith is an instrument of our Justification, it is not as Justification is *actively considered*, or as it is an action of God, How can any *action* of man

man be an instrument to Gods action? but as we are passively *justified*, we are *justified by believing*; its not our faith that doth produce our Justification properly: Therefore, though in Divinity its often said, *Sola fides justificat*, Only faith justifieth, yet that is to be resolved passively in this sense, By faith onely we are justified. Thus all those Arguments, If we are justified by faith, then by our own work, and that this is to give too much to faith, yea more then some say they do to works, which they hold a condition of our Justification. All these and the like Objections vanish, because we are not justified by faith, as Justification is considered actively, but passively. Its true, God doth never justifie any actively, but the same person is passively justified: Therefore though God did will from eternity to justifie, yet he did not actually justifie till in time. Neither may this make it any difficulty how to affirm Justification a *transient action*, when the knowledge or will of God accepting are *immanent*; for in all the undoubted *transient actions* which are, as *Sanctification*, *Preservation*, Gods will and knowledge about these are *immanent* only; the willing of the *existence* or *being* of such a thing in such a *time*, is that which makes it *transient*; I do not here dispute, Whether we are to conceive in God, besides his knowledge and will, an executive power: that would be too tedious, and not very pertinent in this place.

Secondly, *The Scripture speaks of a lawful and good Justification, as also of an unlawfull and sinnefull one, which men are many times guilty of, for Justification is attributed to man as well as God.* Thus *Prov.*17.15. *He that justifieth the wicked is an abomination to the Lord.* This is very frequent amongst men, those that will accuse and condemn the generation of the just, as hypocrites and false, yet will justifie and applaud the wicked, as the best men on earth. Its a very sinfull thing to justifie any wicked cause or action, and to this may be reduced all those that abet or maintain false doctrines and errors. Its an abomination to the Lord to call evil, good, and falshood, truth; there is also a sinfull justification, when men approve themselves and acquit themselves from sinne, as if they had good hearts, and a good life, though at the same

time, not only the Law accuseth them, but they are abominable to God: Oh this false justification is the grand enemy to this Evangelical Justification! Why is it that most who hear this Doctrin are no more affected with it? are not ravished with it? It is because they have a false righteousnesse; they look upon a justification of their own by the works they have done, and therefore they never desire or pant after this. This is the desperate disease of those who are formal, civil persons, preserved from grosse notorious sins, commonly none are more stupid under this precious Doctrine then they. The Phatisees they were plunged all over in this self-justification, *Luke* 16.15. This is the sinne our Saviour chargeth upon them, *Ye are they which justifie your selves*; and *Luke* 18.14. by an instance of a Pharisee and a Publican, is excellently represented, that many times they are justified before God, who have no such thoughts of themselves, thinking the clean contrary, at least knowing they have deserved it; and again, there are others who are very confident, and presuming in their own goodnesse, and yet are wholly abhorred by God: Oh that this mother-sinne, this root of all evil were expelled your hearts! Oh that every one were brought to see this, and to cry out, I have no righteousnesse of my own, I look upon my self and tremble, How shall I come into Gods presence? Oh that upon the discovery of the losse of Gods Image, thou couldst go out with defloured *Tamar*, thinking thy self undone, saying, And I, poor, sinfull, wretched I, whither shall I go? Prophaneneſse is not so great an enemy to Evangelical Justification, as pharisaical righteousnesse. The Jews, because they endeavoured to establish their own righteousnesse, were wholly ignorant of the true righteousnesse. *Paul* would have thought it blasphemy to speak of all his religious duties while a Pharisee, which he doth afterwards, when a beleever, that they were a losse to him, that they were as dung and drosse, such a thought would have been rejected with great disdain: Oh this is it that undoeth most! You cannot, you dare not begin to think, I am in a condemned estate, all my righteousnesse I presume in, is nothing worth: Oh miserable and wretched man that I am, What shall I do?

The

The heart of man is so full of it self, that it dareth not admit such thoughts. But there is a good Justification, and that is when God justifieth the sinner beleeving in and through Christ. God doth not here pronounce a man righteous without a righteousnesse, or that hath no righteousnesse, but because cloathed with the righteousnesse of Christ, therefore is the believers nakednesse covered from the eyes of God.

Thirdly, *There is an absolute Justification* (if we speak in the general nature of it) *and a comparative Justification.* An *absolute* Justification is, when a crime charged upon such a man, is proved to be false, and the party accused prevaileth over his adversary, so that his innocency may be more cleared. This is ordinary amongst men. There is also a *comparative* Justification, when men, though guilty of sinnes, yet compared with others more hainous, seem to have a kinde of innocency, *Minora vitia virtutes vocamus*, Ezek. 16. 51. Thus *Jerusalem* is said to justifie *Sodom* and *Samaria*, though places full of great pollution, because they had not committed half of the abominations of *Jerusalem*. And this comparative Justification is very frequent in the world; How many are there, who therefore justifie themselves, because they are not so bad as others, they runne not into the same excess of riot, neither are they so prophane and opposite to what is holy, as many in the world are? Thus they think God will justifie them, because lesse wicked then others, seeing they do justifie themselves: Oh but how little is their ground of comfort in this respect! for thou art to live answerably to Gods Word, thou art to make that the rule to walk by. Though others are worse then thee, yet the Scripture makes thy life and converfation a state of gall and wormwood, and though to greater sinners there be greater torments provided, yet even to lesse sinnes no lesse then everlasting flames are appointed. A *comparative* Justification is not available without a *positive* and absolute one from God.

4. *There is a Justification* in foro Dei, *in Gods Court, and there is a Justification* in foro Conscientiæ, *in the Court of Conscience.* Then are we justified before God, when he no longer charg-

eth our sins upon us, when he removeth the guilt we are obnoxious unto; Some have thought it hard to conceive of a tribunal God hath in heaven, where before himself and the holy Angels he doth arraign us. And certainly we are not to limit this barre of God to heaven, but so farre, and where God doth demonstrate his anger against sinne so farre, and there may we say God doth erect his tribunal; when God afflicts a man for his sins, either with inward troubles of conscience, or outward calamities; this may be called a summoning of the sinner before his tribunal, then is the offender to apply himself to God for reconciliation, so that this *forum Cœli* is not so to be understood, as if Gods anger were included there, but as manifesting it self either to the conscience, or otherwise. Therefore this second kinde of Justification in the Court of Conscience is opposed only to the Court of heaven in this respect, because many times those whom God justifieth in heaven, feel not, or are not perswaded of his Justification in their hearts: Therefore it is that though partakers of unspeakable priviledges, yet they walk in darkenesse, as having no comfort at all belonging to them. Although (as was declared formerly) this is not Justification, but the sense of it. *Luther* represented this two-fold Justification by those two passages of *Christ* concerning *Mary Magdalen*, for Christ spake concerning her, first, when she did not hear him, *That her sins were forgiven her*, and afterwards he spake particularly to her, *Be of good comfort, thy sins are forgiven thee*; God then may justifie in heaven, and this by a direct act of faith be applied, but the reflex act or certain knowledge of thy Justification be separated from it: God hath his wise ends, why he sometimes bestoweth this priviledge, and doth not give the sense of it, sometimes it is his action alone to separate these two, but at other times, and that fals out too often, the people of God through their careless, unfruitfull and unprofitable walking raise up a great gulf between the light of Gods favour, and their own souls; so that though he is indeed blessed that hath his sins pardoned, that hath a righteousnesse imputed to him, the Scripture cals this man a blessed man, and no other, yet this blessed man may be in his own

sense

sense miserable and wretched, yea a man appointed for destruction; therefore be earnest in prayer to God, not onely to justifie thee in heaven, but in thy own heart and spirit: this will make thee walk thankfully, chearfully and fruitfully. This will be like *Ezekiels* spirit in the wheels. This will be oil to thy bones, and wine to thy heart. It was the sense of this made *Paul* in this Chapter thus victoriously triumph over all opposition: especially take heed of such a life, which though it doth not make a total intercision of, yet it makes a sad interruption in our Justification; when the intercourse of this is stopped, it is like a besieged City that hath all the pipes of water cut off, that have no way of refreshment to come to them, then they would like *Dives* be glad of a drop of water.

Fifthly, *Some learned men speak of an universal Justification, and of a particular one.* An *universal Justification* they call that, when a man at his first beleeving, is received into Gods favour, then there is an universal pardon of all his sins committed, God leaveth not out the least farthing, but it is all discharged: And then a *particular Justification* they call that, which is daily iterated in our lives; for as we daily renew particular sins, so we need daily remission of them: Now although, as I have shewed, Justification denoteth a state of man, and so is universal and unutterable; yet being they call it a particular Justification, and mean thereby onely the renewed pardon of particular sins daily committed, I would not much contend in the matter; we cannot call remission of sinne a state, as we call Justification; for although when a sinne is remitted, we have Gods favour as to that particular, yet we commit more sinnes daily, which would indanger us, were we not in a state of Justificatioo, whereby Gods grace will so watch over us, that no sins shall drive us out of this heavenly Paradise.

Sixthly, *There is a Justification of the cause, and a Justification of the person,* and these are alwayes to be distinguished. *Job* did justifie himself against his friends, and would not let go his *integrity*; this was a Justification of the cause, or matter of fact. And thus *David* oftentimes in his particular

quarrel between his adversaries and him, doth often appeal to God, and plead his innocency, and prayes to God to regard his righteousnesse, but this was not in the *Justification of his person*; then he renounceth his own righteousnesse, and intreats *God would not enter into judgement with him.* To this may be reduced that act of *Phineas*, Psal. 106. 31. executing Justice, *and it was imputed to him for righteousnesse*, not for the righteousnesse of his person, but of that act or cause. Therefore there is a vast difference between this phrase, and that *Rom.* 4. quoted out of *Genesis*, *Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for righteousnesse*, as is to be shewed.

Lastly, *There is a Justification before God and before men.* A Justification before God is, when God himself doth acquit us from our iniquities, and against this no men or devils can put a barre. A Justification before men, is when we walk so holily and exactly according to the principles of faith, that thereby we declare our selves to be true beleevers, and justified before God. This Justification is necessary against all those that glory in the sole and name of Christianity, as if a bare faith separated from holinesse was enough. It was one of *Simon Magus* his *blasphemies*, as History reports, affirming, that faith did make a man free to do what we would, and that it is a slavery to be obliged by Gods command to any holy duties. The *Gnostiques* also tumbled in this mire; and the *Ennomians*, who delivered, That if a man did hold that faith they taught, the committing of no grosse vices would hinder their salvation. This Justification before men by holy works, is that which *James* pleads for in his Epistle, as some Divines conclude; and certainly it is part of the meaning, as in time is to be shewed. Therefore that men may not deceive themselves, through their self-love, saying, They are justified, when God condemneth, the Scripture speaks of a Justification by holy works before men, that so the hypocrite may be excluded, and the good tree known by its good fruit.

SERM.

SERM. XVI.

An Examination of some Distinctions about Justification, much controverted by severall Authours.

ROM. 8. 33.

It is God that Justifieth.

I Shall now conclude this Text, from which we have been informed about the Nature of Justification.

There remain two or three distinctions that are controverted by several Authours, and these are at present to be examined. And

First, *Some distinguish of a baptismal Justification, and a Justification of persons grown up.* This of late hath been agitated, especially Dr. *Ward* for the affirmative, maintaining a Baptismal Justification of all children baptized, *De Baptis. Infant. disceptat.* And the learned Mr. *Gataker*, who is for the negative; and indeed it would be a very hard task to prove the Justification of all Infants baptized out of Scripture. For

1. Hereby must necessarily be established *a two-fold Justification, and that of a different nature,* one of Infants in Baptism, from which there will be often a total and final Apostasie.

2. *Of grown persons,* which (according to the fore-mentioned

tioned Authours opinion, (for I speak not of *Thompson*, *Bertius*, or others of that metall) is perpetual, and from it can be no falling away. Those learned men therefore *Davenant* and *Ward*, who introduce a *Baptismal Justification*, are forced to make this different *toto genere*, from that of *grown persons*; the one (they say) is amissable, the other can never be lost. But by Scripture-direction we cannot walk boldly in these paths. Though indeed the Scripture speaks not directly of Infants Justification, yet by consequence it doth plainly and fully demonstrate it. Not that they are justified by actual faith, as the *Lutherans* contend, but this gracious priviledge is applied to them, surely, though not expressibly by us; some difference then must be granted between an Infants Justification, and a person grown up, but not specifically, or in the nature of it, as if the Justification of the one might be totally intercided, and not the other, for *Rom.* 5. the Apostle chaineth them inseparably together, *Whom he hath predestinated he hath justified, and whom he hath justified he hath glorified.*

Secondly, *This opinion is not so wary as that of others*; for some limit this baptismal Justification only to *elect Infants*, but these extend it to all baptized Infants, because they hold the Sacrament of Baptism *exhibitive of grace*, which is alwayes effectual in the subject receiving, unlesse there be some *obex* or impediment put by the *Suscipient*, which (say they) cannot be in Infants: But to make such an universal Justification of all visible members of a Church, is a great Paradox.

And thirdly, If it be granted, that the Sacrament of Baptism is not onely obsignative, but exhibitive of grace, yet that doth not follow, that it must be in all, and at that time of Baptism, but it may be exhibitive of grace in its due time, when it shall please God by the word preached to work it, and the original corruption every one is born in, is *obex* enough, seeing by that every Infant is a childe of wrath. This doctrinal assertion hath too much influence in the hearts of all, for do not most rest on their Baptism as the ground of their Justification and Salvation, never attending unto those qualifications

qualifications of an holy life, and renouncing the wayes of sinne and Satan to which our Baptism doth ingage us. Indeed the Sacraments are usually called the *organical* means of our Justification on Gods part; but this is not to be understood, as if they had some *inward, latent, physical virtue* in them, as *natural causes* or medicinal pils have, to produce real effects: No they are moral causes only instituted by God; and although he hath promised to go along with his own institutions, yet they do not *ex opere operato*, meerly by receiving of them convey grace, unlesse faith in the receiver make them effectual, as digestion in the stomack makes meat to nourish; therefore to a dead man food would do no good, neither do the Sacraments, where spiritual life is not laid as a foundation. In Popery this Justification by the *opus operatum* of Sacraments is much advanced. The Church (saith *Bellarmine*) hath two Baths to wash away its filth, the one of Baptism for original sinne, the other of Penance for actual; and for the former he alledgeth a place out of *Gregory*, *He that doth not believe all his sins are washed away in Baptism, doth beleeve not Pharaoh and the Ægyptian host were drowned in the red Sea.* But although the Sacraments God hath appointed be not empty mockeries, yet they are effectual onely, where there is due preparation. As the Jews did generally rest upon their Circumcision for Justification; and we may perceive by *Pauls* zealous disputes in his Epistles to the *Galatians* and *Romans*, that works of the Ceremonial Law, as well as of the Moral, were pleaded for by false teachers, as the causes of Justification; so still the same corrupt opinion, as so much sweet poison is received by most men, that they were justified in their Baptism, and therefore they need not trouble themselves with any more fears in this point. But if thou wert justified then, thou wast also sanctified then, for these alwayes go together as light and heat in the fire, and if sanctified, then surely it would have been demonstrated in an holy and heavenly life. Are they not the manifest signes of the contrary? Do not therefore delude thy self, and think to mock God: if there were baptismal Justification, there will also be baptismal Regeneration, *and he that is born of God*

sinneth not, neither can he live, so as wholly to give himself up to the service of it, 1 *Joh.* 3.) *because he is born of God, and his seed abideth in him.*

II. Secondly, *Another controverted Distinction is, of an actual Justification from all eternity, and a declarative Justification in time.* This is the great *Diana* of the *Antinomians*, which hath been at large confuted in my former Treatise. Indeed such a distinction hath unhappily fallen from the pen of some eminent and orthodox Writers, though not improved to such foolish and absurd consequences as the *Antinomists* do. However such a distinction hath no foundation in the Scripture which restraineth Justification to the believer, and describes the godly man to be for the present justified, so that formerly he was under the wrath of God; *Gods purpose to justifie is not Justification, no more then his purpose to glorifie is glorification.* Neither doth this argue any change in God, but in the creature, for he did immutably from all Eternity will such a change upon the sinner believing; God therefore is not properly said to be altered, but man is. Besides its wholly irrational to make our Justification in this life, to be only declarative, as if God did not indeed pardon sinne, but did only manifest that he had done it already from all Eternity. How then can *promises* of pardon be made good, or well interpreted, which are upon the supposition of our believing and turning to God, that then he will turn away his anger, which by the fore-said position was never upon any elect person, all the while he was in an unregenerate estate, and in the height of his impiety? But enough hath been said to this already.

III. Thirdly, The *Arminians*, and all those who hold a total Apostasie from Justification once received, *must distinguish of Justification as they do of Election, an absolute Justification, and a conditionate.* An *absolute* is, when God foreseeth that a man will persevere and continue to the last in his faith and obedience, upon which provision God doth then absolutely justifie him. A *conditionate* is of every man believing and repenting, provided, that he persevere in the same: So that as by their Doctrine no man can be absolutely elected till he die, so neither

ther absolutely justified, for he may fall into such sinnes, as that though formerly justified, yet now condemned, yea to day he may be justified, and to morrow thrown out of that estate. This false and uncomfortable position is maintained by *Thompson* in his *Diatribe*, against whom Bishop *Abbot* hath solidly written. Those that are once justified are never again cast out of his favour, they may want the sense of it; The Sunne may be in an eclipse, but not removed out of its orb; and as *Hooker* observeth well in his Discourse of Justification, added to his *Ecclesiastical Polity*; As Christ once died, but rose again never to die more, death hath no more power over him; so a justified man once allied to God through Jesus Christ, doth from that time forward as necessarily live, as Christ himself by whom it is that he doth live. In his judgement therefore, which is also consonant to the Scripture, a justified man can no more cease to live in this state of Justification, then Christ can cease to live in heaven; and the reason is, because of that immortal and indissoluble *union* which is between *Christ the Head*, and *every believer a member* unto him. Thy Justification therefore doth not depend in the continuance of it upon thy strength and thy power: woe be to us, if we had no other support; but it is built on Christ himself, *who is the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever*: So thy Justification also will alwayes be the same, though thou art many times changed with uncertain fears and doubts.

IV. Fourthly, The great and famous distinction which hath made so much noise in the books of late Writers, is that *figment* and new invention of the Papists, of a *first and second Justification*. The first Justification they call that, when a wicked man is at first made holy and righteous, having a supernatural principle of grace infused in him, which doth inherently justifie him. A second Justification they call that, whereby a man being already just, doth increase and grow in his righteousnesse, and so is more justified. For the first Justification, they would perswade us, that they hold it to be onely of grace, when yet they hold such *preparatory dispositions* that are *merits of congruity* to obtain it. For the se-

cond Justification, they plainly acknowledge, that is obtained by our *merits*, and the good use of grace already received. By this distinction they think *Paul* and *James* may be reconciled. A great difficulty they grant it to be, how to accord both those Apostle, but they think this distinction reconcileth all; *Paul* (say they) speaks of the first Justification, for that is of an ungodly man, and it is by grace freely. But *James* speaks of a second Justification, and that is by the works we do. Indeed *Becanus Tom.* 1. and *Tapper Art.* 8. speak of a two-fold first Justification; the first *Tapper* cals, *per modum simplicis generationis*, or as *Becanus*, when one is made first that was neither first, or unjust before. Thus, they say, *Angels* and *Adam* were justified, there Justification was not of a person ungodly before, but were created in this purity. The second kinde of first Justification, they make to be by way of a qualitative alteration, as when that is made hot which was formerly cold; so a wicked and ungodly man, he by the grace of God is made just and holy. This, they call, the first Justification. But this distinction, as they explain it, is full of falshood and reproach to the righteousnesse of Christ; for both these Justifications are built upon a false foundation, *viz. That our inherent righteousnesse habitual or actual, is that which doth justifie us in Gods sight.* This (as is to be shewed) is against all those places of Scripture, which proclaim imperfection and defilements adhering to the best works we do. Its contrary to the frame of all the godly mens hearts that ever lived, who prayed against Gods severe entring into judgement with them, knowing Justification in the sight of God, by any thing they can do, is wholly impossible.

2. This distinction of first and second cannot hold, *Because a man is justified in the same manner and way in the whole progresse of his life, as at first.* Hence *Abraham* Rom. 4. when yet he did abound with many fruitful works of righteousnesse, was said to be *justified by faith.* The Adversaries do acknowledge *Paul* speaks there of the first Justification, and yet *Abraham* in whom the Apostle instanceth, was not then made righteous of wicked, for a long while before he had served God in all holinesse.

3. There-

3. There cannot be a first and second Justification in the Popish sense, because *the first is said to live by faith*, Hab. 2. which is three times alledged in the New Testament, and is applied to our Justification, as well as to dependance upon God in outward calamities; yea living by faith in respect of Justification, is the foundation of the other life by faith. Till by faith we live, receiving the favour of God through Christ, we are not able in other conditions to exercise the believing acts of dependance; seeing therefore that the first mans life (this life, not only his first conversion) is by faith, and that in respect of Justification, therefore in the whole progresse of his life, he is justified but one way. After thou hast been many years a proficient in the way of godlinesse, thou art to put forth acts of faith for Justification, as humbly and as feelingly of thy own unworthinesse, as at thy very entrance into godlinesse. Did not *Paul* when he had ranne very farre in the race of Christianity, yet *forget all that was behinde, and desire to be found only in the righteousnesse which is by faith*. So that whereas the Doctrine of Justification is reproached for a Doctrine that breedeth security, pride and negligence in holy duties, There is no Doctrine like that so naturally inclining to encrease humility, an holy fear and self-emptinesse, for by this we are taught even in the highest degree of our Sanctification, to look out of our selves for a better righteousnesse; we look upon our selves in the best of our spiritual glory, as so many *Jobs* on the dunghill, or *Lazaruses* begging at the rich mans gate; for how can the soul be filled with great shame and confusion, that seeth nothing but deformity in it self, that dares not by any works he hath done, approach into Gods presence? By *Sanctification* he hath righteousnesse indeed inherent, but not perfect: by *Justification* he hath righteousnesse perfect, but not inherent. Let this then be setled upon thee, as at first thou wast justified freely by the grace of God: Thou sawest thy by-past sinnes compassing thee about, and therefore didst look out of thy self to Christ. Thus it is to be alwayes, though thou hast not the same sins, yea though now thou abounde st with many graces, and hast a large increase in holiness, yet such are the de-

sects and failings accompanying thee in all thou doest, that thou canst not but cry out; Oh let me be covered with a better righteousnesse then that of mine own!

4. There cannot be a first and second Justification in the mentioned sense, *Because even those who are already reconciled to God, are yet daily to endeavour reconciliation with him.* All new sinnes are apt to make new breaches, and these make, though not new total, yet partial reconciliations. Thus *Paul*, 2 Cor. 5. 19, 20. when he said, *God was in Christ reconciling of men to himself*, he addresseth his speech even to those that were reconciled, that they would be reconciled to God, that is, they would not onely abide, and continue in that state, but as often as any failings and imperfections did break forth, they would by repentance turn to God, and entreat his favour toward them; an after-reconciliation then is not by any merits or good works of ours, but by the same gracious foundation it was at first wrought. Hence *David*, Psal. 32. pronounceth it as an univetfal Proposition, of every man at every time, whether at the first or at the last, *Blessed is he, whose iniquities are covered, and to whom sinne not imputed to him.* Know then for thy direction (for it a great matter to be rightly informed herein) that all the day, all the year, all thy life long, thou art to be by faith receiving a righteousnesse without them, as thou doest every moment take in breath. Some have urged that phrase, *Put on the Lord Jesus Christ*, Rom. 13. 14. implying, that as every day we are to put on our garments to cover our nakednesse, so we are to put on Christ for the covering of all our imperfections. This is the difference between man and beast, man comes naked into the world, *Peccata de propria vestiuntur* (saith *Augustine*) and thus it is with man *Theologically* considered, he comes naked and destitute of all righteousnesse, and hath no covering of his own, but must be found in the Lord Christ, whose righteousnesse God judgeth as ours; neither is God deceived at that time, or judgeth otherwise then according to truth; for Christs righteousnesse is truly ours, though

not

not inherently. When our Divines delight to exercise this by *Jacobs* getting the blessing in his elder brothers cloathes, Papists reply, That we make God like old *Isaac*, that through blindenesse cannot discern what is truth; but to say, the hands are indeed the hands of Christ, but the voice the voice of a sinner. This is wilfully to mistake our words, for we all say, God judgeth as the truth is, neither doth he justifie us without a righteousnesse, onely this is not inherent in us.

Thus we have discovered the falshood of that distinction of a first and second Justification, which they may multiply to the hundredth and thousandth Justification, as well as the second.

V. But there are some learned and *Orthodox Writers, that do admit of a first and second Justification, but not in the Popish sense, they utterly abhorre that, yet they affirm a first and second Justification. Lodovic. De Dieu in Rom. cap. 8. v. 4.* a very learned man, is large in asserting this. The *first Justification* is that acknowledged by the Orthodox, whereby, though sinners in our selves, yet believing are justified before God. The *second*, whereby thus justified out of our selves, we are justified before God in our selves. The first Justification is the cause of the second, the second is the effect and demonstration of the first. The first is by faith, the second by works, and both are necessary; and if it should be objected, That then we are justified by the works of the Law; he answers, That these works of Sanctification are not the works of the Law *ratione originis*, for the Spirit of God doth work them, but *ratione normæ*, in respect of the rule by which they are prescribed: And further then (saith he) are we justified by the works of the Law, when they are performed, as the condition of that Covenant; But this opinion looketh not on the Law so, but as its now altered, for the Law is deprived of that dominion it once had, and being subjected to Christ, cannot but praise and approve those works which flow from faith, and are wrought by Gods Spirit, though they be not satisfactorily answerable to the rigorous commands of it: So that by this opinion, when we are first justified

ned

fied by the imputed righteousnesse of Christ then afterwards *our works are accounted also unto us for righteousnesse.* God justifieth us, as being free from prophanenesse and hypocrisie, walking sincerely in obedience to his commands; so that though an inherent righteousnesse be made the foundation of this second Justification, yet it is not from any worth or dignity, proportioned to the rule of holinesse, but from the worth of that imputed righteousnesse from which it floweth, and through whose dignity it is accepted of, and of this later Justification he makes *James* to speak, and so reconcileth him with *Paul.* Its true, other learned men speak something to this purpose; Not only *Bucer*, who is known to place Justification both in imputed righteousnesse and inherent, thereby endeavouring a reconciliation with the Papists, for for which *Pareus* blameth him as too facil. But *Calvin, lib.3. cap.17. Sec.8.* It is one thing, saith he, to dispute, what works avail of themselves, another thing What after the righteousnesse of faith is established, premise remission of sinne and Christs perfection, whereby what is imperfect is covered, and then the good works done by beleevers, *Justa censentur, vel (quod idem est) in Justitiam imputantur*, are accounted unto righteousnesse. To this purpose also *Zanchy, Tom.1. de Justif. Thes.* when a man is first reconciled to God by faith, then a beleever is afterwards accepted of by God, for his good works. Although this be thus asserted, and all the *Orthodox* do readily grant, That our good works are pleasing to God through Christ, yet that this should be called a second Justification, and that before God, there seemeth to be no ground from the Scripture; for (as you heard) *Abraham* and *David* after their first Justification are still said in the same manner to be *justified*, viz. *by faith, not by works.* Its true, God doth accept of beleevers as sincere, that they are not hypocrites, but they are not justified by this; for *David* crieth out, *Psal.19. Who can understand the errours of his heart?* so that there is hypocrisie in the heart of the most upright man for which God might justly condemn him.

Use. Let the Use then of all this be, to pray to God, that thy minde be kept sound in this main Doctrine: Oh let not any subtil

ſubtil diſtinctions poiſon thee! This truth hath an influence into all thy comforts, and into all thy holineſſe, therefore admit not the leaſt corruption here. How many wayes have the corrupt hearts and heads of men invented for Juſtification? The *Turk* hath his way to juſtifie himſelf before God. The *Jew* his. The *Papiſt* his. The *formal Proteſtant* his, and all agree in eſtabliſhing ſome righteouſneſſe of their own, which can no more ſtand before Gods judgement then ſtubble before the fire: ſuch a righteouſneſſe may have greater applauſe in the world, but bring it to God it is abominable. As the eye can endure to look upon a Candle or the ſtars, but is not able to endure the glorious beams of the Sun.

X SECT.

SECT. IV.

Setteth forth what is not that RIGHTEOUSNES whereby a man is Juſtified.

SERM. XVII.

Sheweth, That every Man is prone *to ſet up a Righteouſneſs of his own, to be Juſtified by it, and whence it proceeds.*

ROM. 10. 3.

For they being ignorant of Gods Righteouſneſs, and going about to eſtabliſh their own, have not ſubmitted themſelves unto the Righteouſneſs of God.

HAving diſcuſſed the nature of Juſtification in the general, I ſhall proceed further in this manner: Firſt, To handle negatively what is not that Righteouſneſſe, whereby a man is juſtified, becauſe there are many falſe righteouſneſſes exalted for Juſtification,

cation, and ſhall from this Text in the general, inform how prone we are to ſeek for a righteouſneſſe to juſtifie us, otherwiſe then God hath appointed.

The Apoſtle in the Chapter preceding charged the Jews with heavy and ſad things, but that they might not think this ſpoken from hatred, but love unto them, he doth very paſſionately inſinuate himſelf into their affections in the beginning of this Chapter, which is expreſſed *quoad affectum*, and *quoad effectum*: in reſpect of his inward affection, he tels them *his hearts deſire is toward them*, εὐδοκία, which is very emphatical, and as *Hierom* ſaith, cannot be tranſlated by one word, unleſſe a man ſhould ſay *Placentia*. It was not then every kinde of affection, but the top and higheſt he had towards them.

Again *quoad effectum*, his love is ſeen in his prayer to God for them *that they might be ſaved*: Spiritual love is the moſt active and vigorous. To love a man to his ſalvation, is more then temporal beneficence whatſoever.

In the ſecond verſe he giveth a reaſon of theſe ſtrong deſires towards them, he gives them good teſtimonial Letters, onely he corrects them with a diminution, *I bear them record, that they have a zeal, but not according to knowledge.* Zeal though never ſo fervent in matters of Religion, yet if prepoſterous, if not regulated by Gods Word, is like the ſtrange fire offered upon Gods Altar. Its better, ſaith *Auguſtine, Claudicare in viâ*, then *ſtrenuè currere extra viam.* The Jews did runne, but it was out of the way; They were like a fertile piece of ground, but overgrown with weeds: Had their zeal been right both in reſpect of its original, and its manner, and its objeſt, and its end; Then *Paul* would have delighted to have ſown his ſpiritual ſeed in ſuch prepared ground.

In the third verſe, he inſtanceth, wherein their blinde zeal did hurry them into deſtruction, and that was in the main point and hinge of their ſalvation, *viz.* about their Juſtification, they ſet up a *righteouſneſſe* to be juſtified by, which was directly contrary to the righteouſneſſe of God; ſo that their dangerous miſcarriage is expreſſed in the ſinne it

self, and in the causes of it, the sinne it self is not to submit or subject themselves to the righteousnesse of God; The righteousnesse by which we are justified, is called *Gods righteousnesse*, both because he causeth and procureth it, as also, because its adequately answerable unto his will, and accepted by him, and because it is a righteousnes not of a man meerly, but of God also, as in time is to be shewed. Now to this righteousnes, which with all their hearts and open soule, they should have received, because nothing else could commend them to God, they did not submit themselves, or they were not submitted, such was the rebellion and selfulnesse within them, that they would not rest wholly upon this righteousnesse. Here not the full stomack, but even the empty loaths the honey-comb, though they had a conceited fulnesse. This righteousnesse as its called twice in the Text *Gods righteousnesse*, so its illustrated by the opposite τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην, *their own righteousnesse*. Its called their own righteousnesse, both in respect of the principle from which it did flow, they did those works by the strength of nature without the grace of God, and their own righteousnesse in respect of the subject and inherencie; for suppose any of the Jews had been with *Paul* converted, yet they would not with him be found in their own righteousnesse, but in that which is by faith, *Phil*, 3. so that the works of grace may be called our own righteousnesse, when we seek to be justified by them, although in respect of their original they are not ours; as a mans soul is his own soul, though at first infused by God alone. Thus you have their sin.

The Causes are, first, their *ignorance*, ἀγνοοῦντες; this was not ignorance of the fact, but of the *right*, neither was it invincible, but *wilfull* and affected, for they had excellent means to know to the contrary.

2. There was their *pride* and wilfulnesse in this way; they did ζητεῖν earnestly seek and labour to set up their own righteousnesse, στῆσαι, from sick and weak persons, who would stand, but through their imbecillity fall down immediately, or as a man that would set up an Image, but for want of life it tumbleth down presently; as he said, ἐδεῖτο τί λίθ, it wants some-

something within; as the *Israelites* endeavoured to set up their *Dagon* before the *Ark*, though that tumbled down before it. Thus these Jews endeavoured to establish their poor, weak and cadaverous righteousnesse in the presence of Gods glorious, just and holy Majesty, which yet was no more able to stand before him, then stubble before the fire.

3. There is their *rebellion* added to their *pride*, they would not *submit themselves*; a man naturally is as disobedient to a promise to receive the righteousnesse offered by faith, as he is to a Command to fulfill the duty thereof. This is good to be observed, thy heart was not once more averse and untoward against the holy commands of God, then now since broken for sinne, it is opposite to Gods promises for a righteousnesse; Not onely our Sanctification, but our Justification also findes strong rebellion against it in all our hearts.

That every man naturally is very prone to set up a righteousnesse of his own to be justified by it, contrary to that which God hath appointed. Publicans and grosse sinners do not more oppose the way of practical godlinesse, then *Pharisaical* men do the way of Evangelical righteousnesse. Not onely righteousnesse inherent, but imputed also, is extreamly contrary to mans corrupt nature; we say, Christ shall not reign over us in respect of his Priestly Office, purchasing a righteousnesse for us, as well as in his Kingly power enjoyning holy Laws to walk by.

Observ. Every man is prone to set up a Righteousnesse of his own.

To set this truth before you, I shall discover the *on* of this Doctrine, that it is so, and then bring the demonstration or the *don*, why it is so, and the diligent attending to this will not only make you know Justification by Books and by Sermons, but you will feel the power and sweetnesse of it upon your own heart; for I write not only to the *intellectual part*, but the *affective* also. A Ministers *Motto* should be, *Nusquam doceo ubi non moveo, nusquam moveo ubi non doceo.*

First therefore, That its imbred in all to seek after another righteousnesse for Justification, then what is Evangelical, appeareth, *In the corrupt Doctrines and Opinions of all*

That it is so proved. I.

men almost about it. As there were but *eight persons preserved in the Ark*, when *the whole world was drowned*; so there are some few preserved in the sound and true Doctrine of Justification, when almost the whole world *erreth* dangerously, if not damnably about it. As for those that are without the Church, its no wonder, if they, as they reject a Christ, so also the righteousnesse which comes by him. The *Jew*, the *Turk*, the *Pagan*, all of them approach to God as absolutely considered, and so expect acceptance by those works they do. No wonder if the Jews do so now, for they did of old so, when yet they had the Prophets discovering Gospel-righteousnesse to them, and all their Sacrifices might abundantly convince them, that they had nothing of their own to put any confidence in. Hence God by the Prophet *Isaiah* threatens, *Chap.* 51.12. *I will declare thy righteousnesse and thy works, for they shall not profit thee*; God will make them ashamed of their righteousnesse, as well as their sins; Oh this is excellent, when a man is amazed and in an holy manner confounded even at his holinesse, as well as at his offences! Therefore he addeth *vers.* 13. *He that putteth his trust in me* (*viz.* renouncing his righteousnesse) *shall possesse the Land*; and *vers.* 15. *The high and lofty one that dwels in the high and holy place, doth also dwell with the humble and contrite spirit to revive that.* Now, who is this humble and contrite spirit? Even that which goeth out not onely of his sinnes, but of all his duties and graces, and being ashamed and cast down in himself, is revived only by the grace of God without him. Come we to those *within the Church* that professe their faith in Christ, and you would think there was an universal consent in this great priviledge of Justification. But nothing is more controverted, How much unjustified is the Scripture-Justification of most? What accusations and condemnations of one another about Justification? Insomuch that *set some few, even a remnant, aside, comparatively, the whole Christian world, both Doctors and people, learned and unlearned, fasten on a Justification by works*; and that which the Apostle doth industriously oppose they labour to bring in, but with many subtil distinctions, and fair disguises: the *Papist*, the

the *Arminian*, the *Socinian*, the *Castellian*, the *Swinckfeldian*, with divers others, all conspire in this, That our righteousnesse is inherent by which we are justified; most of them make *faith* and *works*, some few *faith only*, as its a *gracious act*; so that the τὸ *credere*, *the very believing is accounted of by God, as a full, compleat, legal righteousnesse*. Now, whence cometh it, that all do so readily joyn in this falshood? but because Justification by something in us is so pleasing and connatural to flesh and bloud: Its a Doctrine that naturally breedeth in our hearts; and therefore as all men grant the fire to burn, and the Sunne to shine, because this is evident to sense; No lesse do all conspire in this, that we must do some thing, work some thing, that by that we may be accepted of by God. So that the universality of such corrupt Doctrines, shew what is the root in our heart. These *Froggs* could not breed but from such noisome spawn.

A second Discovery of our proneneſſe to a Justification that is not Evangelical, is, *From the confidence and cordial trust men put in the religious duties they perform.* So that what ought to be given to Christ and his righteousnesse, they attribute to their duties. That look as the *Idolater* gives that worship and honour to wood and stone, which is due to the wise and holy God only: Thus such hope and confidence do men generally put in the good works they do, which belongs only unto Christ. Our Saviour represents this in the Pharisee, *Luke* 18. though he *giveth God thanks that he is not thus and thus, that he doth pray and fast*, yet it is by this *working* he looks to be accepted. There is not a word of his sinne, of his millions of imperfections in every duty he did: But as high as he was in his own thoughts, so low and abominable he was in the sight of God. That is a remarkable expression, *Phil.* 3. 3. *We are the Circumcision, who rejoyce in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh*, that do renounce all duties and priviledges, making the glory and joy of out souls to be in Christ onely: Oh take heed then of this deadly poison, to have a secret trust and rest of soul in the good things thou doest! The stone is not more enclining to

2.

fall

fall downward, then thou art to take up thy reſt here, and though thou art no prophane or ungodly ſinner; This heart-confidence in duties performed, is milſtone heavy enough to drown thee in the ſea. This leproſie did ſpread it ſelf over the *Jewiſh Nation*; this made them ſet up the works of the Law againſt Chriſt; and the *generality of Chriſtians are as much formalized, and made Juſtitiaries as ever they were.* This ſinne devoureth ſecretly without a noiſe, as the moth doth cloath, it doth not as groſſe ſinnes conſume like a roaring Lion.

3. Thirdly, *Men are averſe to Evangelical righteouſneſſe, in that they are ſo apt to ſelf-juſtification, and clearing of themſelves, all is clean and good in their eyes.* They have good hearts, good works, God is their good God; there is nothing (as they judge) but good in them, when their hearts, if ranſaked into by Gods word, is a noiſom dunghill; This was the Phariſaical righteouſneſſe, *Luke* 18. *Ye are they which juſtifie your ſelves.* And ſo the Jews of old, though under Gods grievous judgements, yet would plead with God, as if they were not guilty; they thought Gods wayes were hard and inequal: So hard a matter is it to acknowledge ſinne, and to be willing to be aſhamed becauſe of it, whereas the *Publican that went away juſtified,* he humbled himſelf, he bewailed himſelf a ſinner; and certainly then is a man in an hopefull way for Juſtification, when with *Job he abhorreth himſelf,* becauſe of the ſpiritual ſores and ulcers that are all over him, then he is neareſt to God, when he ſets himſelf afarre off, as not being worthy to come into Gods preſence; when, as our Saviour directs, thou ſetſt thy ſelf at the lower end, then will Chriſt bid thee come up higher: But oh the ſelf-love and ſelf-flattery which reigneth in every man: who is willing to be convinced a ſinner, to accuſe and arraign himſelf, as a ſinner, to judge and abhorre himſelf, as guilty of all the wrath God threatens in his Word! Oh how hardly is he brought to think himſelf undone, to ſee his nakedneſſe and poverty, to acknowledge he is a beaſt and a devil! No, this will never be done, till God break and ſoften the heart, and therefore how many are admiring the vertuous and in-

nocent life they have lived, as he did the glorious *Babel* he had built, and even then, when (as he was) they are near utter confusion?

Fourthly, *Our proneness to a contrary way of Justification then God hath appointed, is spun in that vast of an appetite, and heavenly relish, which a gracious heart useth to have in the Doctrine of Justification.* Were people spiritualized, sensible of the burden of sinne, of the infinite imperfections that cleave to them, of their inability to answer God in any particular; There is no truth in the world would be so acceptable to them as this, for this they would say, *The word of God is sweeter then the honey-comb*; Why is the Gospel commended by so many admirable Titles, The *precious* Gospel, the *glorious* Gospel? but because of the admirable excellency an Evangelical spirit findes in these things. At the first Reformation out of *Popery*, when this pearl of Justification lay all over covered with dirt and mire, the superstitious Doctrines of Popery, but by the means of those excellent Worthies God raised up, discovered and purified; How many humble, precious and contrite hearts did God also fashion by his grace, that for that truth, above all, in Reformation, did blesse and praise God for? For as *Calvin* well urgeth, What foundation can be laid either for true piety, or solid comfort, if a man in the first place be not satisfied in what relation he stands to God, upon what terms God and he are? Oh but now this manna is loathed! Now many Sermons may be preached, and the auditors very few whose hearts melt, and are ravished within them, while they hear of it, I tell thee, *Thou canst not discover a more carnal, dead heart, destitute of Gods Spirit, then to sit like a stock or a stone under the preaching of this truth.* Thou wouldst (if heavenly) finde all thy bowels move within thee at the approach of this Doctrine unto thee; As they received Christ corporally, crying *Hosanna*, and saying, *Blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord*; Thus wouldst thou do concerning this Gospel-truth: But thy heart like *Nabals* is a stone in this case, and thou findest no heavenly excellency in this pearl, because thou art of a swinish nature, and so preferrest thy base lusts before it.

4.

Fifthly, *Our averseness to a Gospel-Justification is discovered by the want of an hunger and thirst after Christ.* We have not an high and inestimable value that we put on him; *Paul* is sick alwayes while he hath not Christ: The Church in the *Canticles* is not more ravished with her Spouse, then *Paul* with Christ, 1 *Cor.*2,3. *He determineth to know nothing but Christ crucified,* and *Phil.*3.8. *He counts all things dung and drosse for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ*; and whence hath *Paul* this high esteem of Christ? Even because of the spiritual hunger and thirst that is in him. Never did hungry man long for a morsel of bread, never did *Samson* long for water through thirst, more then he doth after Christ, because of the spiritual need and want he findes of him. Christ as a Mediatour propounded in the Scripture, is like the brazen Serpent to a stinged and pained beholder. But the generality of Christians, though they name Christ, and speak of him, yet they do not with the Church runne after him in the sweetnesse of his ointment, *Cant.*1.3.

Why it is so. Whence it is that men are so prone to set up a righteousnesse of their own.

Thus we have heard this truth discovered by the *In*, the signs or effects thereof. Let us now consider it in the causes thereof. And

A doctrinal Ignorance of some points in Religion. 1.

First, *A doctrinal ignorance of some main points in Religion, is that which makes many so mistake in Justification.* This you see is the cause in my Text, named as the first of all. Their ignorance in these ensuing particulars makes men not acquainted with, or carefull of a Gospel-Justification.

1. *An ignorance of the pure, holy and just nature of God,* that he is a God of such absolute purity, that nothing but absolute holinesse can consist before him; that those things which may even dazle the eyes of men, are yet but as dung in Gods account, *Hab.*1. *Thou art of purer eyes then to behold iniquity*; See the glorious purity and Majesty of God expressed notably, and mans contemptible vanity respectively, *Job* 25. 5,6. *Job* 4.17,18,19. *Job* 15.15,16. There we see the heavens and Angels themselves *are not clean in his eyes*, how much lesse weak and sinful men? He doth not there speak of Apostate Angels, but those that continue in their purity. Now even the Angels themselves are ashamed, though not having the least

least blemish, *they cover their faces*, even the noblest part of them, because God is of such infinite Majesty: would not this then debase the most holy man that is, if he did consider what a God he hath to do with? And though men may proudly and vainly dispute about the *condignity* of their works to Justification, yet when they come to die, and shall think of appearing before so holy a God, they will quickly pull down their top; and if it were possible with *Adam* to hide themselves from the presence of God, when they shall see their nakedness; certainly if Angels be thus debased, what shall poor, weak, sinfull man do?

2. *Ignorance of the purity of the Law, and the exact, strict obligation thereof.* Did men consider what that holiness is which the Law requireth, that it pronounceth a curse to all that fail but in the least particular, that it will admit of no obedience but what is perfect; then every man must cry out, That they are but dead men, and damned men by the Law: This makes the Apostle so vehemently dispute against those presumptuous conceits of righteousness by the Law: if it be so, *then Christ died in vain, and if Christ died in vain, then are we yet in our sins*; if therefore men make godliness of such a size and measure as they please, thinking that is all God requireth which they do, no wonder if they go boldly and demand a crown of glory as the reward of their labour; no marvel if they say with that wretched Friar, *Redde mihi vitam æternam, quam mihi debes, sive velis, sive nolis*, Give me that eternal life thou owest me, whether thou wilt or no: Oh pestilent mouth to utter such *blasphemy* that infecteth the very air! How contrary is this to the humble spirit of believers, which hath always *in forma pauperis*, begged for the glory of heaven? That say spiritually, what *Job* spake corporally, *Naked* (of all merits, unless of hell and damnation) *came I into the world, and naked* (of all merits of glory) *shall I go out of the world.* Let not then every righteousness, though applauded and admired by men, that the Law doth approve; Was any righteousness more glorious then that of the *Pharisees*, yet *Matth.* 5. our Saviour pronounceth, *That unless yours exceed that, we cannot enter into the kingdom of hea-*

ven; and *Rom.*7. *Paul* there proclaimeth what high and puffed thoughts he once had, while a Pharisee, he thought to have life by the Law; whereas *Augustine* said, *Da Domine quod jubes, & jube quod vis*; Lord, give me to do what thou commandest, and then command what thou wilt: He can bid the Law command what it will, he is ready to obey: Oh but how ashamed and confounded is this *Paul*, when once he understands what this spiritual and holy Law is, *Then the Law revived, and he died*; then he was undone, he could not hold up his head any more; then he looked on himself as a *Judas*, as a *Cain*, then he seeth every thing prepared to undo him; Then as *Paul* said in the contrary *Rom.*8. *The whole Creation groaned for the liberty of the sons of God*; So might he say, All the creatures groaned to bear such a wretched sinner, and longed for his perdition: Go then and look into the pure *Glasse* of the Law, as *James* exhorts, *Chap.*1. 23. and there thou wilt see such spots and blemishes, such deformities upon thee, that thou wilt be a monster in thy own eyes, and not able to endure thy self.

3. *Ignorance of the reliques of corruption abiding in us, and conflicting with us, makes us not esteem the Gospel-Justification*: For a man might think, and thus many write in their Books, Though while a man lived in his sins, he needed a Justification by grace that must deliver him; yet when once he hath a supernatural principle, and a divine nature within him, then certainly he needs not such a Gospel-justification: but all this is, because they know not *the combate of the flesh and the Spirit*; they feel not the strugglings of those two twins within them; if they did, they would easily believe there was no appearing but in the *wedding garment of Christs righteousness*; Then they would consider how truly the Prophet *Isaiah* said, that not their unrighteousnesse, but their very *righteousnesses were like a menstruous rag*, Isa.64.6. What are our unrighteousnesses and our sins, if our holy things be thus compared to what is most abominable?

3

SERM.

SERM. XVIII.

Another great Cause of Mens trusting in their own Righteousnesse, viz. A Practicall Ignorance or Inconsideration of some Necessary Things relating to our Actions.

ROM. 10. 3.

For they being ignorant of Gods Righteousnesse, and going about to establish their own Righteousnesse, &c.

WE mentioned three doctrinal points, the ignorance whereof made men *Narcissus*-like, fall in love with themselves, wholly rejecting the grace of God without them. I now adde some more.

4. Therefore in the fourth place, *Ignorance, or a not attending to Christ both in his person and office, is that which makes them lay a dead childe in the room of a living one, a dead and empty righteousnesse instead of that which is efficacious and powerfull.* Did we truly consider of this great and unspeakable mystery, That *God* should become *Man*, and be as a Surety for us, suffering and doing what we should, it would immediately make us abandon our own works, and flie to him only. The Scripture speaks of his *Person* and *Office*: of his

Person, that he is both *God* and *Man*; and without either of these he could not have been a Mediator: And for his *Office*, the Scripture is plentifull in informing of us, That he was not made man, or became obedient to the Crosse for his *own self*, but wholly *for us*, 2 Cor. 5. 21. *He was made sinne for us, that we might become the righteousnesse of God.* 1 Cor. 1. 30. *Who of God is made unto us wisdome, and righteousnesse, and sanctification, and redemption:* So *Col.* 1. 19. *It pleased the Father that in him all fulnesse should dwell*; where the Apostle sheweth at large, *that he is the Head of the Church*, so that we are *compleat in him*, Chap. 2. 10. Why then is it that the Scripture doth represent *Christ* in a far greater glory then ever *Solomon* had? Why doth it make him the Ocean of all our joy and hope, the *fulnesse that filleth all* our emptinesse? but because we should not look for any fulnesse or compleatnesse in our selves, but in Christ alone: So that whatsoever in Justification is attributed to thy self, so much is taken from Christ. The Scripture cals Christ often *Our Righteousnesse*, it mentioneth nothing for our righteousnesse but him. All the children of God have renounced themselves, and would be found onely in Christ: Why then art thou such an enemy to thy true consolation, as to seek for a righteousnesse by thy own working? Though the people of God have works of righteousnesse, yet they have not righteousnesse of works. If then at any time thy heart be lifted up within thee, humble thy self with the thoughts of Christ; If this be so, then Christ was a Mediator in vain, he was made man in vain, & died in vain: Can we think that Christ came into the world to share the glory of our salvation between man and himself? No, but as the Moral Law is, *We are to have no other gods beside him*; so the Gospel saith, We are to have no other Mediator but him: Oh then if thou didst study Christ more, and convince thy self thorowly of the fulnesse and sufficiency that is in him, thou wouldst be restlesse and disquieted within thee, till thou wert centred on Christ; Thou wouldst be as *Noahs* Dove, that found no setling place, when the waters covered the earth, till she got into the Ark.

5. 5. Another cause of self-justification, and refusing Christs righteousnesse

righteousnesse, is, *The deceit of subtil and crafty distinctions, which corrupt mindes have brought in*, so that whereas they dared not immediately and grosly contradict *Paul*, who doth so professedly dispute against Justification by works, they invent many plausible and specious distinctions, hiding deformed and ugly errours under fair disguises: So that what the Scripture saith of *Absolons* battel with *David*, *The wood devoured more then the sword that day*, the same may we say, The crooked windings and labyrinths of distinctions loose more souls then open grosse errours: Insomuch that they have so many glosses and fair colours, that the simple are easily deceived, thinking all is well; but the Snake lieth hid under these sweet flowers; for when we do urge, That *Paul* excludes all works from Justification, and makes an immediate opposition between believing and working, so that he doth not admit of any *medium*; The Adversaries like *Jezabel* paint their faces, and look very boldly. Its true, say some, works are excluded, but such as are done by the meer power of nature, such are granted to be wilde grapes, and to have no sweetnesse in them, but the works that are done through grace they are not shut out. Others, Works are excluded, but not the works of the Moral Law, but the Ceremonial onely; they were not to seek Justification by Sacrifices and Circumcision, for now Christ was come, these were antiquated. Others they draw a smaller line, and they say, Works are excluded, yea even the works of grace, but not as works, onely as merits; so that the working is not disputed against, but the merit of working, as if thereby heaven and glory might be demanded by way of debt. Again, Others they say, Works are excluded, but such works as are perfect and fully commensurated to the Law; by such no man can be justified, but through grace and a merciful condescension, our imperfect works are accepted of to our Justification. Thus you see by all these subtil distinctions, men would be thought not to thwart Scripture; Every one saith, *Paul* is not against me, the Scripture doth mean works in the sense as I mean, I say as the Scripture saith, and grant what that affirmeth. Now by these subtil insinuations, the simple is enticed, as *Solomon* speaks of

the

the adulterous woman, into dangerous nets, and is undone before he thinketh any thing. Take heed then of subtil and groundlesse distinctions, think not to put off the great Judge of the world with them. Its as if a man should cover himself with cobwebs in the midst of a battel, thinking that will serve for a strong harnesse to defend him against all dangers.

6. A sixth cause of this proneness to our own righteousnesse rather then to Christs, is, *From the sublimity and supernaturality of that way of Justification, which the Gospel hath revealed*: So that it being several wayes supernatural, its no wonder if our hearts naturally do not close with it. As

1. *Its supernatural in the revelation of the truth of it.* Had not God revealed such a way of Justification, we should no more have thought of it, then of any other mystery in the Christian Religion. So that as from the Scriptures onely we come to know *that there is a Trinity, that God became man, that our bodies shall rise again*; Thus from them only we come to know, that we are justified, not by working, though by the most admirable and choice works that can be, but by believing in Christ. Hence *Rom.* 1. 17. *The righteousnesse of God* is said *to be revealed from faith to faith*; *Revealed*. Therefore all the *Aristotles* and *Platoes* in the world never thought of such a way. This then is the cause so many look after a false Justification, and rest their souls upon an unsound and rotten righteousnesse. The Gospel-righteousnesse, as it is wholly of Gods procuring, so its also of his revealing; and therefore as the other Doctrines of Christian Religion are above our reason, so is this also; we are as hardly perswaded of such a righteousnesse by Christ, as we are of Christ himself being God and man.

2. *The supernaturality of it is in the contrariety of it to flesh and blood.* The truth of it is not only above our understandings, but the practice of it is against our hearts. *Adam* in the state of integrity looked for Justification by works; so that this Gospel-justification is not onely opposite to man fallen, but man standing also. It was never in mans nature to seek for a Justification by a righteousnesse without us:

Now

Now this contrariety of Gods Justification to our self justification, is, because in Gods way we are emptied of all things, we are discovered to be beggars, to be undone and damned in our selves; and the heart of man will never yield to this, till it be broken and contrite, in pieces, losing all its former fashion and figure. This Gospel-Justification being then both for the nature of it, and truth of it, wholly supernatural, its no wonder so few have any discerning of it; they must be Eagle-eyed that can look into this Sunne. The Apostle *Heb.* 5. 13. sheweth, that even a godly man while a babe, one that is in the beginnings of Christianity, is *unskilfull in the word of righteousnesse, i. e.* the Gospel, which declareth true righteousnesse; Therefore this is called *strong meat*, and fit for those who by reason of use, or an habit and perfection in holinesse have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil: Oh what a long while is it, ere the new convert is directed to this way of Justification! What perplexities? What troubles of heart? What sad temptations do befall him, and all because he is unskilful in this subject, and its the grown Christian who comes to have a discerning spirit in it!

II.
Another cause of mens proneness to trust in a Righteousnes of their own, is, A practical Ignorance or inconsideration of some necessary things relating to our actions.

Seventhly, *A practical Ignorance or Inconsideration of some necessary things relating to our actions, is the cause of proneness to a false Justification, as well as speculative ignorance of the fore-mentioned dogmatical points.* If therefore a man did seriously attend to some such practical truths, as are to be mentioned, he would be as much afraid to abide in his own righteousnesse, as *Lot* in *Sodom*, when fire and brimstone were ready to devour. For

1. *Let him consider how great his omission is of the good things he should have done*: Oh, who is able to abide, when he shall consider what this command and that required! What duty here and there he ought to have done, and yet failed many times? And certainly, if upon a supposition of doing all, we are commanded, to say, *That we are unprofitable servants*, God is not bettered, or made more happy by us, how much more when we neglect so many things we ought to do? Hence therefore when the Scripture speaks of the good works the

godly have done, yea when they are mentioned to their praise, yet mercy and forgivenesse is at the same time desired. Thus when *Nehemiah* reckoned up the great acts of service he did for God, yet saith, *Chap.* 13. 22. *Remember me, O my God, and spare me, according unto the greatnesse of thy mercy.* So concerning *Onesiphorus* who was truly according to his name *Onesiphorus* to *Paul*, 2 Tim. 1. 16, 18 for he oft refreshed him, was not ashamed of *Paul's* chain, yea sought him out very diligently, yet what saith *Paul*? *The Lord grant he may finde mercy of the Lord in that day.* You would think *Paul* had spoken of some great sinnes of *Onesiphorus* before; No, but he speaks of his eminent and admirable graces, and yet prayeth thus heartily for mercy which always supposeth misery: If therefore at any time thy heart begins to be lifted up within thee, because thus and thus thou hast done, Oh check thy self with the omission of many thou oughtest to have done: Who is able to hold up his head if God remember the neglect of this and that duty against thee? This consideration will make us to mention Gods righteousnesse only, and that with great vehemency and assurance of soul, as you have it notably expressed, *Isa.* 45. 25. *In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory:* The seed of *Israel* is there the spiritual seed, the chosen ones of God, these shall be justified in the Lord, not in their own graces or works they do, and these is the consequent of this, They shall glory, which could never be, if Justification were to be by our own works, for then we had matter rather of shame and confusion within our selves. And further observe, whereas at *vers.* 23. its said, *Every knee should bow unto God, and tongue swear by him,* The main matter wherein his worship is seen, is, *Surely, shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousnesse.* This truth of having righteousnesse only in the Lord, hath such a prevayling authority upon every godly man, that he shall swear it, and in his worship of God (which is *Synechdochically* expressed by swearing) This will be the great stay and comfort of his soul, that in God only consists all his righteousnesse.

2. A second thing in our greatest miscarriages, whereby we idolize

idolize our own righteousness, is, *The not considering that if we do any good at any time, it was by our own power, or our own strength, but wholly by the grace of God:* So that we cannot be justified by this, but rather thereby our own impotency is the more discovered, as is well observed by *Mr. Truelove* in his little Treatise of Justification. That the more we are enabled by grace to do any thing, the more supernatural help we have, the less are we justified in our selves. Hence the Scripture when it speaks of our Justification always expresseth it *passively*; we are justified never *actively*, unless in an ill sense, as *Luke* 16. when the *Pharisees* are said to *justifie themselves*. Thus *Damascen* of old well argued, That by no works of Grace could we merit, because the more Grace we had, there was the more obligation of thankfulness to God, we received more gifts from God; So that in the most doing of any good, we ought to be humbled; For from whom comes this power? Who giveth then this assistance? Lest then in my pride, like a dead flie in the box of ointment spoil all. It was the expression of an ancient Writer, As those that draw up pure water, sometimes have frogs come up with the water that make it loathsome: Thus many that are imployed in heavenly and great works of God, as the Spirit of God is working in them, so their own humane spirit, and corrupt principles co-operate therewith, and thus the comfort of a duty is lost: As the *Pharisees did all to be seen of men, and so they had their reward*, that was their punishment and their judgement, to have that glory from men, which they wholly looked after: If therefore at any time thou art enabled to *believe* or *repent*, know in this thou doest not give to God, but God gives thee: So that is a pernicious Doctrine which *Socinus* teacheth, *Tract. de Justific.* That in Justification, the main thing is to look to those things that are within us, not without us. If this were so, then *Paul* was sorely mistaken, *Philip.* 3. *that would not be found in his own righteousness, but that which is through faith in Christ.* Certainly, the safest course is to most attribute, That

in Justification we are to look more to that which is without us then within us; we are to live spiritually, as we do naturally, as naturally we live by receiving in breath from without; So we spiritually live by receiving in righteousnesse through Christ: If then all be of Grace, then Justification is not from or by any thing we do.

3. Thirdly, We do not practically attend to this also, *That when we are inabled by Grace to do any thing that is good, yet as this gracious Action cometh through our hands, it admits of much soyl and imperfection.* Some have thought it blasphemy to say, The gracious Actions we are enabled unto by Gods Spirit, are imperfect; As if (say they) Gods Spirit did any thing imperfectly, not considering that *Paul* (Philip. 3.) though he had the Spirit of God dwelling in him, yet accounts all that he did as *dung and drosse* comparatively to Christs righteousnesse. Besides, Though the Spirit of God worketh these things in us, yet it is not made one person with us; it doth onely efficiently produce them, not vitally and formally. The Spirit of God doth not believe or repent, though it enableth us to those things; as naturally its not God that eateth, or drinketh, or moveth in us, though by his assistance we are enabled to do all. Further, its a known Rule, That *Quicquid recipitur, recipitur ad modum recipientis*; Pure water running thorow a foul Pipe, getteth some soil upon it; Excellent Wine will taste of the Cask, if it be not sweet: So that, although the same Action as it cometh from God be perfect, yet as it floweth from us, is vitiated and made imperfect several wayes.

4. Fourthly, Men do not practically attend to this; *Suppose, That by the Grace of God thou dost that which is truly good, yea that is absolutely and perfectly so, yet this is not enough to the Law, because that requireth the universall frame of all good works commanded.* As the Apostle *James* saith; *He that breaks one is guilty of all.* Its an usual saying, The Law of God is copulative, that is, it requi-

feth the connexion and chaining of all duties together; so that if a man were able to perform one or two good duties in a most absolute manner, yet unlesse he did perfevere in all, he had not the righteousnesse of the Law. *Socinus* (*Tract. de Justificat.*) grants that the Apostle *Rom.* 4. excludeth works of Justification, not onely as merits, but as they are works; onely he saith the Apostle means by workes the whole *congeries* or order of all good duties required by the Law, and thus none is justified, but then, he saith, the Apostle *James* when he attributeth Justification to works, he doth not take works for the universal observance of all Gods commands, but but for the frequent and constant use of them, though accompanied with several failings and omissions. But this will not heal the wound he hath made. Although we grant, That if a man could perfectly and compleatly fulfill the Law of God in some particular command, yet unlesse there were a general observation of all, there could not be any subsisting before God: Attend not then to some few particular duties done, though never so eminently and exactly, for unlesse thou art able to say, Thou hast kept all, and failed not in any one particular, there cannot be any Justification by works.

Fifthly, If men did practically consider not onely the *Omission of many good things, but the commission of many sinnes daily, they would make them fit out of their hopes of Justification by Christ.* For if there be but one sinne that may be laid to thy charge, though all thy other life for the future were as perfect as that of the Saints and Angels in Heaven, it could not avail to Justification, because that one sinne in the guilt of it would preponderate and weigh down all thy duties, one sinne would be more to condemn, then all the holinesse to save thee; and this is the ground why it behoved us to have such an *High Priest*, that was altogether *without spot*, or *blemish*, because if he had sinnes of his own, he could not have satisfied for another: What madnesse then and blinde-

blindenesse doth possesse men, that they should endeavour to set up that for a covering, which will indeed be like so many sparks of fire to consume them, like so many briers to rent and rend them? They do in this matter of Justification, as the Jews in their calamities, run from one refuge to another, from a Serpent to a wall tottering that would fall upon them.

5. Lastly, Men do not consider, *That when they have abstained from sinne, that is hath been many times not out of love to God, or hatred to sinne, but either because the opportunity hath not been, or else outward fear and shame, and if so, thou art farre from a Justification by this.* The Israelites many times in their afflictions were kept from sinne, but it was something without kept them, as the bounds of the Sea keep in the waters, it was not from any true sanctified principle within: So that if any one do but think of all these particulars, they will quickly melt within, and be afraid of themselves, they will cry out, Woe be unto me in my best condition: What the *Psalmist* said, *Every man at his best is but vanity*: The same they will say even of their spiritual condition; and what the Prophet said, *All flesh is grasse, and the flowr thereof fadeth away*, The same in some sense, with reference to Justification, they may speak: Even their spiritual Graces are as grosse, and fade away, when the scorching beams of the glorious Sunne of Righteousnesse shall appear. More causes may be discovered of our proneness to be our own Justifiers and Saviours, but they will come in opportunely hereafter.

Use. And therefore let it be of Exhortation to you, to bewail that self-righteousnesse in you, that averseness to a Gospel-Justification. Why is it that the oil of the Gospel is no more precious to you? Is it not because you are not wounded with the sense of sinne? The poor man esteemeth wealth, the pained man ease, the sick man health. Its want and pinching necessities that make men prize mercies: And thus it is here, till our hearers are spiritu-

spiritual, even fainting under spirituall languishing, because of the heavy load of sinne, they put no doe esteem upon the Lord Christ.

But thou wilt say, I am well enough, I doe not finde my self in such an undone estate, I am full and want nothing.

I answer, Even therefore thou needest all things, therefore thou needest a Justification without thee, because thou thinkest it is within thee: Oh man to be pitied and wept over! Christ wept over *Jerusalem*, because she was not sensible of her temporall destruction; But oh how few are apprehensive of their spiritual damnation! Let them be brought into temporal wants, they do nothing but think of them, and speak of them; but when in spiritual wants of a righteousnesse to cloathe them, then they are not affected.

Let not then this truth leave thee, till it hath had its proper operation upon thee, till thou art in thy sense as wretched as that exposed Infant the Prophet *Ezekiel* speaks of, *Ezek.* 16. wallowing in thy bloud, full of noisomenesse, and no wayes able to make thy self comely, for such ornament God onely puts on thee.

SERM. XIX.

The Necessity of a perfect Righteousnesse: And how destitute all men naturally are of it; With the Grounds thereof.

ROM. 3. 10.

As it is written, There is none Righteous, no not one.

WE are pursuing the Negative part, or, *What is that Righteousnesse whereby we are not Justified.* For this general introductory hath been dispatched, That men are very propense to establish their own righteousnesse in opposition to that which God hath procured: And here in the Text we see a peremptory and universal exclusion of all men in the world, if considered in their natural estate from such a righteousnesse, as may justifie them before God. For whereas the Apostle distributeth all mankinde into *Jew* and *Gentile*, he sheweth they are both alike impotent and wretched in the matter of Justification: For although at *vers.* 1, 2. he saith The *Jews* advantage is much every way, in respect of the *Gentile*, yet he doth not at *vers.* 9. contradict himself, when he saith, the *Jew* is in no wise better then the *Gentile*; for in the former verses he speaks of Church-priviledges and visible Prerogatives, wherein the *Jew* highly transcended the *Gentile*,

Gentile; but at the 9th *verse*, he compareth them together in the great businesse of Justification, and then the *Jew* with all his worship and knowledge of the *Law*, is no better then an ignorant unbeleeving *Gentile*. As mountains and high hils may seem great, if compared to the valleys, but if with the heavens, then the hils and valleys are but as a *punctum*, and all is nothing to them: Even the prophane man that is accounted of as a dunghill, and a formal Justiciary, that is admired as a Saint, yet in respect of Justification are both naked and miserable alike, for in Gods sight no man is justified by any works he doth.

Now that both *Jew* and *Gentile* are both alike in respect of Justification, the divine Apostle saith, *v. 9. That he had proved it before.* The word is observed by the learned never to signifie to *prove a thing*, but rather to *accuse* and *charge*, to *make complaint*, and thus it best agreeth here; and the Indictment drawn up against the whole world, even all men of all sorts, is, *That they are under sinne*, both in the condemning power of it, and also the reigning power of it; *Under it*, which denoteth the weight or load of sinne; *Under it*, which signifieth sinnes dominion, and their slavery unto it; *Under it*, so that they are unable to shake off the tyranny of it: Oh that as the *Israelites* could humble themselves and mourn, when they were under their oppressours, and servants ruled over them; So we could as spiritually prostrate our selves before God, because of the yoke sinne hath put upon us! for we cannot say of sinnes yoke, as *Christ* of his, *that it is easie and light*: Or if it be so for a while, yet at last the burden will be intolerable, making thee to tremble and cry out with *Cain*, *My sinnes are greater then I can bear.* This charge which the Apostle laid upon all mankinde, he doth again in the verses following at large prove; for there is nothing so necessary to the diseased person, as to see the danger of his disease: Its the beginning of our heavenly cure, to be strongly convinced of our undone estate: And that the Apostle may not seem to speak out of particular malice, or as if he were some churlish *Misanthropos*, he brings *Scripture* for what he saith, *As it is written.* Now you must know that

the verses alledged are from many places in Scripture, *Psal.* 14. *Psal.* 53. *Psal.* 5. *Psal.* 14. *Psal.* 36. & *Isa.* 59. For although in the vulgar Edition all these are added in *Psal.* 14. yet by the *Papists* themselves, *Pererius* and *Sanctius*, its confessed they are not in the *Hebrew*, nor in the *Septuagint*, and *Pererius in loc.* doth well reprove *Lindanus* that would from hence prove the *Hebrew* corrupted by the Jews, for why should they do it in this place, when it related not to *Christ*? it being only moral matter, and that which is in other places of Scripture. From all these places joyned together, we may see what a loathsome leper all mankinde is, that the whole world is an hospitall of *Lazaruses* of diseased ulcerous persons. Its good for every one to meditate on them, for none is excluded. Their corruption is set down, first, *Universally*, then *particularly*, or by induction of parts, and that *negatively* and *positively*: *negatively*, by denying the graces of the soul, of the minde, *none understands God*; of the heart and will, *there is none that seeketh after God*; of the body, *They all turned aside*, which universal sentence is amplified by sinnes of words, expressed by their instruments, of *throat, tongue, lips and mouths*. Their sinnes of works are expressed *Synecdochically* by the Ministry and service of their *feet*, with the effects of them; all which sinnes are illustrated by a two-fold cause, the fountain of all, want of love to their neighbour, *The way of peace, they have not known*, and want of fear to God, *There is no fear of God before their eyes*: So that here you have a most admirable and lively description of man by nature; you see what a beast, what a toad, what a devil he is. Where are they that will advance free-will, plead for the purity of nature, and deny original sinne? This is a true faithfull looking-glasse to represent every one in, for the words are universal and emphatical: *There is none righteous, no not one*. Let no man plead an exception, and think he is not within the compasse of this charge; one by the difficulty it, in what sense to explain this; and some like are that take these expressions in an hyperbolical sense, not that every one was thus unrighteous, but because the generality was corrupted. But this cannot stand with the

Apostles scope, which is to shew, that all mankinde was *under sinne*, and could not be justified by *works*; Therefore if any were excluded from such an indictment, these persons would be justified by works, and so the Apostles inference would not hold *ex vi termini*. Others they say, *None is righteous*, *i. e.* to such a perfect, absolute righteousnesse, as the Law requireth. Others, *None is righteous*, *i. e.* so as not to commit some sinne or other sometimes. But that which is most genuine is, that the Apostle here speaketh of what every man is by nature, that he is thus positively and negatively miserable, as soon as he hath a being; for although the Apostle reckons up actual sinnes, and such as every one doth not commit, yet because the inclination and propensity of all are to such wickednesse, and its not because they are born with lesse defilement then others, or have more innocent natures then others, but because God puts bounds to mans sin, and he restraineth even where he doth not sanctifie. Therefore the expression is universal; As we say, All Toads and Serpents are poisonous, though actually they have not poisoned any. The sense therefore is, That *none is righteous*, both in respect of Sanctification, because by nature full of sinne, and in respect of Justification, and so are not able to endure before the consuming presence of an holy God. To clear this truth, consider

I. God made man righteous.

First, *That God made man righteous, he was created like the glorious heavens, there was no spot or blemish in him.* Had mankinde continued in that integrity, then the contrary would have been true, *There is none unrighteous*, *no not one*. The Image of God is said to be in righteousnesse and true holinesse, *Eccles. 7. 29. God made man upright, but he hath sought out many inventions.* As therefore now since man is fallen, the Apostle shutteth out the righteousnesse of works; so if he had stood, the righteousnesse of faith had been excluded. The condition then we were created in, was so full of righteousnesse as the heavens of starres, then man approached to God as absolutely considered, there was no necessity of a Mediatour, or an atonement: yet though this was so happy an estate, Divines conclude, that our estate of reputation

is more blessed then that of integrity; not only in respect of duration, for *Adam* totally lost his happinesse, but so shall not the believer; but also in respect of that righteousnesse, whereby he stands justified before God, for though *Adams* righteousnesse was inherent and perfect, not stained with the least sinne, yet it was a creature-righteousnesse: But ours, though imputed, and not in our selves, feeling many imperfections, yet its the righteousnesse of Christ, God and man. Our Justification then is as full of solidity, comfort and joy, as *Adams* in integrity, yea it far transcends it.

2. But he presently lost it.

Secondly, *Though God created man with a righteousnesse, yet he presently lost it, both for himself, and for all his posterity, so that there is not a righteousnesse to be had by any man living.* There is not naturally any such thing in the world: What thunder and lightning should this be in our ears? Every man by nature is in an unjustified estate by God, and that includeth all misery, as Justification doth all happinesse: if not justified, *God is angry with thee all the day long.* Thou hast no peace with God or thy own conscience; thy chamber, thy bed must alwayes be an hell to thee; thou art cursed with all the curses of the Law: Therefore though for the present thou walloweſt in thy pleasures and luste; Thou eatest, and drinkest, and runnest into all excesse of riot. Yet there is nothing but condemnation belongs to thee: Oh that men had hearts to consider and tremble at this! How canst thou live a day, yea moment without Justification? Thou art naked and exposed to all the vengeance of God, will not this make thee eat the bread of trembling, and drink the water of astonishment? This righteousnesse is lost; Thou hast nothing but rags and filth upon thee. God and thy soul are at a vast distance, yea and direct contrariety: Oh that men should not think all other miseries, though never so extream, to be but small in respect of this want of a righteousnesse! Yet we can complain under the want of food to nourish us, of cloaths to cover us; but who goeth wringing the hands, and bowed down with the head, crying out, I have no righteousnesse to stand with before God?

Thirdly,

Thirdly, *Though man hath lost a righteousnesse to be justified by, yet there is an absolute necessity of having one.* God cannot love or delight in any thing but righteousnesse: You have heard how holy, pure and righteous God is, and therefore loveth only such as are righteous, if our prayers and duties be not the performances of righteous persons, God loathes them, whosoever is not according to his holy will, he utterly rejects it, he turneth his eyes from it: Oh that people would meditate on this more! They say, Let us go to the Ordinances, let us pray and hear; but they never think, Where is the righteousnesse that I must put on to make me accepted? Like the man in the Parable, they venture to come to the feast, though they have not a wedding garment: Men naturally think their holy duties are their righteousnes, & they come to do these, expecting thereby to be justified; but oh thy vain and deceived heart! Thy duties are not thy righteousnesse; but thou needest a righteousnesse to cover the deformities of them, and to make them accepted. *Abels* person must first be accepted before his offering can be: So that the Sunne is not more necessary for the eye to discern objects, or the air for men to live by, then a righteousnesse is to do all holy duties acceptably in Gods sight. *So that this righteousnesse is to be sought in the first place, without this we build without a foundation, We cannot proceed one step in Christianity without this covering.* But as the hand full of earth or drosse cannot receive gold; so a man filled with the thoughts and apprehensions of his own righteousnesse, cannot look out for the true righteousnesse: All our conditions are like the Church of *Laodicea*, Revel. 3. 17, 18. *Who thought her self rich and needed nothing, when indeed she was poor and miserable*: Therefore she is *counselled to buy eye-salve, and to get raiments to cloathe her nakednesse with.* This is all our conditions, we think our selves full, when we are empty; we judge all well, when if we knew what we are, we should neither sleep nor eat, for the wretchednesse we feel our selves in.

3. Yet there is an absolute necessity of having a righteousnes.

Why no man by nature hath a righteousnes to be justified before God.

In the next place, consider the grounds why by nature none have a righteousnesse to be justified by.

1. And the first obvious clear cause of this, is, *That original pollution every one is plunged into; so that from the head to the sole of the foot, there is nothing but filth and putrefaction.* Hence *Ephes.* 2, 2. by *nature we are said to be children of wrath.* That is directly contrary to Justification; Howsoever the doctrine of natural pollution hath been questioned by many, yet to every true beleever the Scripture and experience makes it of undoubted truth, so that he is as sure he is born full of sinne, and a childe of wrath, as that he is born at all: And indeed all the misery he is environed with naturally, doth evidently proclaim his birth-pollution. *Celestius* the *Pelagian* being unwilling to deny original sinne, yet made it to be *res quæstionis*, not *fidei*, a meer controversie, and no Article of faith, against which *Augustine* did with all his might oppose himself. *Erasmus* also, though he would not be thought to *Pelagianize* in this point, yet in his Exposition on *Rom.* 5. doth labour to enervate those choise and eminent Texts for it, affirming, That Divines in their Theological matters, have done like the Astronomers, who when they were not able to answer many difficulties, invented their Epicycles and eccentrical motions, *&c.* Thus he thinketh they did about original sinne. But who will regard him much, of whom *Gerard* writeth, that he was bold to affirm, That such was the Authority of the Church to him, that if it should determine *Pelagianism* or *Arianism* to be the truth, he would beleeve it! and indeed had *Erasmus* been more humbled under the power of original sinne, his Discourse would not have been so meerly moral as it is, in all his writings little surpassing a *Seneca* or *Plutarch.* Here then is the foundation to be laid, He that denieth or extenuateth original sinne, must also deny or extenuate Christs righteousnesse; Not that Christ came onely to wash away the guilt of original sinne, as some have absurdly taught, but because this is the fountain of all our calamity. By this we are *children of wrath*, though we had never committed any actual transgression. By this it is, that God is justified in the damnation of Heathens, yea and their Infants also, though they never heard of Christ, or enjoyed the means of grace; How

then

then can they by nature have a righteousnesse to justifie, who are full of sinne to condemn? How can they be children of grace who are children of wrath? And truly, he onely will build upon the rock, who diggeth thus deep, even to the bottome of nature defilement; and because this is spiritually discovered, as you see by *Paul*, Rom. 7. hence the number of those is very few that are able to put a due price upon the *Lord Christ* and his righteousnesse. He that would make the way plain for Christ, must beginne with the true sense of the depth, breadth and length of original sinne; here it is true, *That one deep calls upon another*; The depth of original sin for the depth of Christs righteousnesse.

Secondly, *As men are thus wholly become leprous and abominable, so by this defilement they are obnoxious to Gods wrath.* 2.
There is no more in them then in devils, why they should be justified; See what the *Apostle* inferreth from this large description of their natural pollution, *v.* 19. *That every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God.* All the world is guilty, ὑπόδικος, They all lie at Gods mercy, they are all dead and damned men; and because of this *every mouth is stopped*, it hath nothing to boast of, yea nothing to plead or say for it self: So that with the man in the Parable, no sooner shall God say to us, *How came ye in hither?* but we must be *speechlesse*: Oh how little is this bewailed by us! We think not that we came into the world so many condemned persons, that every houre all the sentence of wrath may passe upon us. To be born lame, blinde or deformed, is indeed an heavy calamity; but to come into the world an enemy to God, and God an enemy to us, is not at all regarded.

Thirdly, *No man naturally hath a righteousnesse to be justified by, because if he abstain from committing any sinne, it is not from right and holy grounds, and if he do that which is for the substance good, yet it is not from pure ends.* 3.
We suppose that if a man by nature have a righteousnesse to be justified by, it must be from something within him; it must be either infused or acquired. Now if we look over all men by nature, we cannot

not finde not one man, no not doing one action, thereby to be accepted of by God: so that if God should make a more condescending profer in this case, then he did to the matter of *Sodome* to *Abraham*, it could not obtain an effect. Should God say, If among all mankinde considered in and of themselves, you can finde fifty righteous actions, I will pardon all mankinde for them, fifty could not be found; yea if the Lord should descend from fifty to ten, yet mankinde could not be helped. Nay, should we go further, then *Abraham* thought fit, If amongst all mankinde can be found one righteous action, it shall be justified; yet in this case, though all mankinde did lie at the stake, there could not be any help found for it; for if sinne be not committed, no man naturally can do it from principles of faith and love, or from the renewed Image of God within; its because he wants the opportunity, or some outward restraint is upon him. Was *Jeroboam* the lesse guilty, because when he stretched out the arm to hurt the Prophet, that immediately withered, and so he could not accomplish his wicked design? Thus it is with all men naturally, they have the seed of all wickednesse in them; every one would be a *Judas*, a *Cain*, only God that bounds the Sea that it doth not overflow the banks, doth also limit and bound the wickednesse of natural men. Thus also if they do what is good, the Lord doth not account it to them for righteousnesse, because they never can do any thing to its true and ultimate end, as *Augustine* often. It was vain glory which made them perform most of their noble imployments, and if they did any good action for its particular end, as relieve the necessitous from a compassionatenesse to mans misery, yet they come short of the universal end, which is Gods glory; so that whatsoever doth not ascend as high as this, is to be judged but *splendidum peccatum*, a glittering sinne, and so cannot justifie before God.

4. Fourthly, *No man can naturally be justified before God, because he is born destitute of the knowledge of God, and faith in Christ.* Now *John* 17. 3. *Its eternal life to know God, and Christ* sent as the Mediatour; and *Heb.* 11. 1. *Without faith its impossible*

impossible to please God. Insomuch that the Scripture every where ascribeth our *Justification* to *Faith.* Now take a man as he cometh naturally in the world, let him not hear of the Scriptures, or know of Christ, What would his own natural abilities avail thereunto? And certainly, if though the Gospel be preached, yet so many remain without faith, as Christ complaineth, *Who hath believed our Report?* What faith would be found amongst men, if there were no Revelation of the Gospel? Man then is born devoid of Justification, and faith to receive it, and that not as he is born destitute of the Arts, no Philosopher, no Physician, for these things he can attain by Education, through the help of those common principles of reason that are in him, whereas for our Justification, and the way thereunto, we have nothing that can co-operate in the least degree of activity.

SERM. XX.

Sheweth, That every Man by Nature is Spiritually Impure and Unclean, both in his Person, *and in all his* Actions, *and therefore cannot be Justified by his own Righteousness. And treats of the Salvation of Heathens.*

ROM. 3. 10.

As it is written, There is none Righteous, no not one.

WE are demonstrating, That none comes into the world with a righteousnesse by nature, but in the direct contrary with unrighteousnesse, and all manner of enmity against God, being the children of wrath passively and actively, hating and hated of God.

II. To what hath been said, we may adde this further discovery, *That every man by nature is spiritually impure and unclean, both in his Person, and in all his Actions:* And therefore is like the leprous person that was to stand aloof off, and to cry, *He was unclean, unclean.* In these two things, the impurity of his person, and of all his actions, is summarily comprehended

bended all the filth and pollution of mankinde. Now that the person must first be reconciled and made acceptable in Gods sight before any thing he doth can be approved of, is plain from *Abel*, to whose person God had first respect, and then to his offering. And so our Saviour, *Matth.* 7. 18. affirmeth, *That a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit, and therefore the tree must first be good before any fruit can be good.* Now its plain, all men by nature are corrupted Trees, they are bitter fountains, they are a wilde stock, till ingrafted into Christ: yea *Tit.* 1. 14. *They are all over impure and unclean, and thereby every thing becomes unclean to them.* Oh then, Where are they that admire and plead for mans righteousnesse by nature, when the Scripture represents him thus loathsome and abominable! But this defilement is not onely on his person, it redounds and overfloweth to all that he doth; so that a dung-hill may as well cleanse, or pitch may make white, as a man by nature be justified; and from hence it is, that *Augustine* of old, and our *Protestant writers* of late maintain against *Papists*, That all the works of Heathens, yea of unbelievers, and unregenerate men, are sinne; There is not one good action to be found amongst them, which though it may seem a cruel and bloody opinion thus at one blow to make the condition of all mankinde with the most glorious actions, to be hopelesse; yet it is no more then what the Scripture is plain for, *Heb.* 11. *without faith it is impossible to please God*, so that all men naturally being destitute of faith, are not able to please God in any thing. If they eat, if they drink, yea if they pray, if they come to the Ordinances, in none of these things are they pleasing to God. That fore-mentioned place, *Tit.* 1. 15. doth evince this, *That to the defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure*. All their natural, civil and religious actions are made unclean to them; for their civil actions of their calling, even that which is thought to be most innocent and harmlesse, yet that is said to be a sin, *Prov.* 21. 4. *The ploughing of the wicked is sinne*; he doth not say, his merchandizing, his buying and selling, wherein may be much fraud and injustice, but *his ploughing* that is sinne. How so? It cannot be from the matter of the action, for that

A mans person must be accepted before his works be approved of.

is good and lawful, but from the condition that the natural person is in; he being corrupted, there cometh also a corruption to all his actions. As the plague and pestilence may be conveyed in the sent or smell, though even to the very gold and silver that infected persons have: Oh what confusion should be upon thee, to consider that all the day long, thy works, thy imployments have been so much constant sinning against God! Not onely thy prophaneneſſe, thy oaths, thy curſes, but thy ſowing, thy mowing, thy buying, thy ſelling. Thus the number of thy ſinnes ariſeth higher and wider, then ever thou thoughtſt of. So true is that of *Anſelm. Omnes actiones infidelium peccatum eſt, & nihil bonum ſine fumo bene*, yea their religious actions in which they are apt to put all their confidence, and reſt on them as the ſure ground of their ſalvation, they are all ſo many ſinnes as flowing from them, *Prov. 21. 27. The Sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord.* See here how God accounts of the religious duties of unregenerate men, *they are an abomination*. This word is uſed to ſhew the higheſt diſdain and diſpleaſure God can have, and therefore commonly in the Scripture *Idols* are called *Abominations*. Thus even the choiſeſt and moſt excellent religious duties of any unbeliever, are an abomination to God, and can that which is an abomination juſtifie? Can that which God hateth, as *Iſa. 1.* with the like hatred he doth all the groſſeſt ſinnes that are? Can theſe reconcile God? Oh be at laſt convinced! Thy religious duties do not ſanctifie thy defiled perſon, but thy defiled perſon polluteth thy religious duties. This truth was lively repreſented under the Old Teſtament, by the *legal uncleanneſſe*: if a perſon ſo guilty medled with any holy things, they did not take away his uncleanneſſe, but he defiled them; And to this purpoſe the Prophet *Haggai* doth notably ſpeak, *Chap. 2. 12, 13, 14. If a man that was unclean did touch holy things, theſe holy things were made unclean by him.* There is not ſcarce any truth more fundamentally neceſſary to make way for Chriſt, and highly to eſteem Juſtification, then this; when thou ſhalt conſider, that all the day long thou art damning thy ſelf, and whatſoever thou doeſt, eat or drink, work or pray, all is unclean to thee,

thee; for what will amaze and astonish thee if this do not? Thou wilt see thy self like *Peters* sheet, full of unclean things, and if any thing, this surely will make thee afraid of thy self, and seek out for spiritual relief through Christ. I am unwilling to leave this truth, till every one be practically and cordially convinced of it: Till this foundation be laid, in vain do we build up any thing of Gospel-Justification, only take some salt to season the former truth; When we say, *That no men by nature are able to do the least righteous or good action*, though the salvation of all mankinde doth depend on it.

This is not to be understood, as if we put no difference between the actions unbelievers do, that it is all one whether an unregenerate man did pray or commit adultery, whether he did outward acts of Justice, or be full of violence and rapine; No such matter is intended: only we say, Their actions may be divided into two kinds; some of them are in their nature vicious and sinful, as to lie, steal, &c. Others are for the matter and substance of them good, onely in respect of circumstances, and other requisite conditions, they become sinnes: As if an unregenerate man walk justly and righteously to his neighbour, relieve a man in necessity, honour his parents, or preferre the publick good before his private, as many *Romans* did. These actions for the nature of them were good and commanded, but because they failed in many other things, therefore they were sinnes as to them; for the old Rule is, *Malum ex quolibet defectu*, any defect makes an action to have sinful, but *Bonum ex integra causa*, good must be of all its causes: Goodnesse is like harmonious musick, if any one string jarre the harmony is marred; Its like beauty compleated of the symmetry of all the parts, if any one part be deformed, the beauty is vitiated, and thus it is in all good actions. [so any thing be never so admirable for the nature of it, *To give the body to be burnt*, or to suffer Martyrdom, if there be any failing or error either in the principle, manner or end; Thou hast lost the comfort and the reward of the duty. And thus all men naturally they cannot but be defective in these things.

Wherein the defect of the actions of all men meerly natural lies.

from the principle from which; Till the Tree is made good, the fruit is not good, till a man be regenerated and renewed in the image of God he doth nothing supernaturally, so operari sequitur esse.

2. They are not ingraffed in Christ from whom onely we have power to do what is holy, John 15. 1. unlesse we are branches in him we cannot do any thing.

3. There is a defect in the *manner*, which yet is the form and life of all moral actions. Its not enough to do that which is good, unlesse we do it well; it must be *bene* as well as *bonum*.

And then lastly, they notoriously misse of the *glorious end*, to which every action ought ultimately to relate, and that is God himself: So that from these particulars it is, that no man improved to the utmost in his natural abilities can procure a righteousnesse to be justified by.

III. Yea I shall adde a third Proposition or demonstration of mans utter impotency in respect of Justification, That he is so farre from having a righteousnesse out of his own bowels to cloath himself with, as the Silk-worm makes her curious web, that he cannot in the least manner dispose or prepare himself thereunto. He cannot do any thing, whereby either to merit or to oblige God to bestow Justification upon him, which must needs stop every mans mouth. It cannot be denied but that there are ordinarily preparatory works upon the soul in order to Justification, such as conviction of sinne, sense and feeling of the burden of it, general desires to have some ease, but yet these are neither preparations of mans own strength or power; Neither are they so much as meritorious *de congruo* of Justification; yea they are not necessary antecedents, for how many have such works upon their souls, have many troubles and anxieties of heart, and yet never obtain this glorious privilege of Justification: So that in plain, no man by his natural strength can any wayes prepare or fit himself for this mercy. Howsoever the Councel of *Trent* judged this Doctrine to be worthy of an *Anathema*, yet they might as well have condemned the Scripture it self. Its true, they suppose an Heathen improving his naturall well, for

which

which God will reveal supernaturals and wonderfully make known Christ and Salvation to him, but when they are desired to produce any such one Heathen, they can do it no more then the Chymists his Philosophers stone; so that Justification alwayes findes a man unworthy of that favour, yea it meeteth with him in a state wholly opposite to it; and whereas the sinner might justly have looked for damnation, he obtaineth Salvation: So that every justified person hath greater cause to melt under the favour of God, then *Saul* under *Davids* had, when yet that wretched man could not but weep to see *David* spare him, though his great enemy, when he had the opportunity to cut him off: Oh how justly may the soul melt with thankfulnesse! saying, Oh Lord! Shall all this goodnesse of thine be shewed to me an enemy? What not only delivered from hell and all punishment, but admitted also to those eternal joyes in heaven? Who can but be amazed at this? Hence the Scripture alwayes attributeth our Justification to the free grace of God, diligently excluding any works we can do; and certainly if in the continuance of our Justification, that be alwayes retained by meer grace, so that no works of ours, though regenerated, and endowed with an heavenly principle within, are causal of it, How much rather are men impotent and undeserving, while abiding under the power of sinne, and no wayes able, but to do every thing in a sinful manner?

These things may suffice to witnesse this truth against all mankinde, and let the Scripture be true, though every man be a liar; yet though Gods word doth thus plainly debase man, as to the point of Justification, There are many that cannot digest this; They will never be perswaded that they are thus all over plunged into sin; What, do nothing, and that all the day long, *but treasure up wrath against the day of wrath?* Who can hear this Doctrine? Yea there are those that revile this Doctrine, as making God very unmerciful and cruel, damning the farre greater part of mankinde with their little Infants also in eternal flames, because they believe not in a Christ, of whom many never heard. There are therefore those that have stood up, and pleaded the Heathens

thens case, and said, *That they may be justified and saved only by the knowledge of God as a Creator, if so be they walk honestly according to that light they have:* Hence they have asserted a Judaical and Ethnical piety, as well as a Christian, and grant a Justification and a Salvation even without a visible Church.

Not to speak of the Heretick's *Rhetoriani* of old, to which many of late have joined themselves, who dogmatized, *That every one might be saved in any one Way of Religion, though never so opposite to another.*

There are those of greater repute, who have pleaded for the Heathens salvation, although they are divided amongst themselves; for some have said, *The just and wise Heathen is justified and saved, but by Christ, though they have no knowledge of him; Even as Infants are saved by Christ, though they do not believe in him.* Others, they have said, Reason hath been enough to their Justification, if they obeyed the dictates thereof, and asserted, That man is called λογικὸς, because he followeth Christ, (who (say they) is called λόγος, because he enlightens every man with reason that cometh into the world.

Others they grant, Such as are saved have some knowledge of Christ, but an implicite not explicite; They have a readiness of heart to beleeve whatsoever God shall make known to them, though as yet nothing of Christ is expresly manifested to them.

In Antiquity, the two that are most famously instanced in for this opinion, are *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Chrysostome*; The former affirming, That Philosophy did by it self justifie the Heathens, and that what the Law was to the Jews, the Gospel to Christians, the same Philosophy was to the *Gentiles*. And as for *Chrysostom* he saith, To know God, was once enough to salvation, but now its necessary to believe in Christ.

Concerning the opinion of these Ancients, we may reade *Causabon Ex.* 1ª *in Baron.* who is positive, That they did hold salvation to the *Gentiles* without the knowledge of Christ. But the learned *Vossius Thes. de vitâ Gent.* dissents, and makes a moderate

moderate construction of their words; So also doth *Sixtus Senensis* (*lib.6. Annot.51.*) a learned Papist concerning *Chrysostom*. Howsoever this be, its certain that we are naturally very prone to think of the mercy of God so illimited as to reach to the *Gentiles* also.

Augustine speaks the heart of every man in this point, *Ep. 99. Virtutes Gentilium, quadam indole animi ita delectant, ut eas in quibus hæc fuerunt vellemus præcipuè ab infernis cruciatibus liberari, nisi aliter se haberet sensus humanus aliter justitia Creatoris.* The virtues of the *Gentiles* do so naturally delight us, that with all our hearts we would they might be preserved from hell torments, did not an humane sense judge one thing, and the justice of a Creator another. In this point therefore we are to lay aside all humane reason and natural affections, attending to Gods word onely.

The *Remonstrants* in this Question would suspend, as thinking man might hold the affirmative from a principle of commiseration to mankinde. *Vives* and *Erasmus* are propense to this. Hence *Erasmus Præf. ad Tull. Offic.* placeth *Tully* in heaven, a place so full of glory, that neither Papists or Protestants have dared to set *Erasmus* himself there. *Andradius* the Papist did with great animosity plead for the justification and Salvation of Heathens, whom *Chemnitius* solidly refuteth. So also *Barlæus*, against whom *Vedelius* wrote that Book, stiled *De Deo Synagoga*. Now although the Apostle say, *What have we to do to judge those that are without?* yet that doth not hinder, but that we may positively determine, that by Scripture, there is no Justification or Salvation without the Church. And therefore, though some Heathens have shamed Christians by their morality, and have transcended in many practical perfections, yet we cannot say, That thereby they are justified, which hath been already abundantly proved, partly from original sinne, and partly from that spiritual impurity thereby cleaving to their persons and actions, as also, because they are without faith, without which there cannot be any acceptation. We grant indeed that many who were not of the visible Church, have been justified, as *Job*, *Melchisedech*, the *Egyptian* midwives, and *Rahab*, with

many others. But we say, these had the means of grace one way or other vouchsafed to them, and so were instructed in the true knowledge of God, and thereby were made of the Church. Again, We grant a different degree in the knowledge of God and Christ. Some have more explicite knowledge then others, and God requireth of some a greater measure of knowledge then others, according to the means of grace they do enjoy; yet we say, That none can be justified or saved without the knowledge of God and Christ in some measure or degree. And to the former Arguments, we may adde these Texts, *Rom.* 10.13,14. where first its said, *Whosoever shall call on the Name of the Lord, shall be saved.* Now lest it might be thought Heathens and Pagans, they can pray to God, they can call on him, he addeth, this is not acceptable praying, *For how shall they call on him, if they do not believe? And how shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard? &c.* Where you see plainly a connexion between acceptable prayers and faith, as also between faith and the Ministry. Another pregnant Text is, *Act.* 4.12. *There is no other way of salvation, or name under heaven by which we can be saved, but by the name of Christ.* The name of Christ is Christ known and believed, and there is no other way: So that Heathens cannot be justified one way, and Christians another. For as they that hold the contrary say, The knowledge of God as a Creator is necessary to Justification, otherwise they could not walk thankfully, or consider their duty, the same is to be said concerning Christ also; and certainly if righteousnesse could have come to the *Gentiles* by nature, Christ died in vain, was a Mediator in vain, as also the Scripture and Ministry is in vain, seeing absolutely Justification might have been had without them. There is one place much instanced in for the contrary, *Act.* 10. concerning *Cornelius* a Centurion, an Heathen souldier; now before he believed in Christ as the *Messias*, God saith of him, *ver.* 4. *Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God.* And *Peter v.* 35. saith, *In every Nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousnesse, is accepted of him.* But the answer is, That this *Cornelius*, as also the *Ethiopian Eunuch*, they were not absolute

lute Heathens, they had heard of Christ, and so had the initials of faith already begun in them, although they were directed where to have more full and clearer knowledge; and none can fear God or work righteousnesse, but he that hath the seminals of faith, and the principles of regeneration within him. Although we also adde, That there is a two-fold acceptation, 1. General, whereby God as a Creator doth accept of his creature, and mercifully provide many favours for them, and upon their humiliations, though not truly sanctified, release temporal punishments, as we see in *Ahab*, and many others. And secondly, There is a gracious acceptance, thereby to ordain to eternal life, to justifie, and to become reconciled with their persons; This is onely within the Church, and to those therein that truly fear God.

Use. The Use is deeply to humble us, and to make us lie low before God. Never did the poor cripple lie with more earnestnesse and vehemency, expecting the Angels descent into the pool, then thou art to wait for the grace of God to justifie thee: Oh consider how dreadful it is, to stay a day, a night, a moment in an unjustified condition: for while so, thou hast no peace with God, go from one place to another, still the sentence of condemnation is upon thee! As the *Egyptians* found all their waters turned into bloud, they could not go to brooks, or rivers, or cisterns, but still all was bloud: So it is here, all is damnable matter, whether thou eatest or drinkest, whether thou labourest or sleepest, all turns to hell. Oh that men would believe this! How restlesse and unquiet would they be till being justified they had peace with God?

Serm. XXI.

That none can be Justified by the Works of the Law, though they are done by the Grace of God.

Gal. 3. 11.

But that no man is Justified by the Law in the sight of God, it is evident: For the Just shall live by Faith.

IN this Epistle the Apostle vindicateth two things:

1. His *Office* and *Ministry*.

2. The true Doctrine about *Justification* against that corrupt errour broached by false teachers; that the Law, or the works of it, were either in part or in whole requisite to Justification, that Christ himself was not sufficient to Justification without this additament. In the confuting of which dangerous errour, he is full of strong Arguments, and withall observed to be more severe and sharp in his words, then in any other Epistle.

Tertullian (as *Grotius* relateth, *Prolog. in Epist. Gal.*) thought this to be the first Epistle he wrote, and that immediately upon his conversion, and therefore thinketh it to be attributed to that fervency and heat which usually accompanieth new converts. But its rather to be attributed to the greatnes and dangerousnesse of the errour, and their pertinacy therein, for he makes the consequent of such opinions, to out the main-

maintainers of them from grace, yea and to make Christs death in vain.

This errour was the more intolerable in the *Galatians*, because they were not *Jews*, (to whom happily something might be indulged, because of their education in the Law, and the high esteem of it) but *Gentiles* newly converted to the faith from their Paganism, and so had not the temptation to dote on the Jewish way, to which they were wholly strangers.

Now, what is the righteousnesse of the Law? or to be Justified by the works of it? And what was the true and proper state of the Question between the Apostle and false teachers, will hereafter be more largely declared? In the mean time you may take notice, That among many other choice Arguments, this Text hath one against *Justification by the Law*.

So that in the words you have the *Proposition* to be proved, and the *Medium* by which he argueth.

The Proposition hath these parts in it:

1. The *Subject*, with the note of universality in a negative way, *No man*. So that *Abraham*, *David*, and the holiest that are, are included in this Subject; in other places, *all flesh*, Rom. 3. which is to shew the frailty and weaknesse of all, and that in every respect; for that phrase, *All flesh is grasse*, doth not only reach to our bodily infirmities and mortality, but even to all the righteousnesse we have; and therefore *John* Baptist is to cry this Doctrine above all, as being most preparatory to Christ and his righteousnesse: yea by *David* its said, *None living is justified*, which is so extensive, that some have thought it reached even to Angels themselves, that they are not justified absolutely by their own righteousnesse, but the context seemeth to restrain it to man.

2. There is the *predicate* or *attribute* [*Justified*] of which enough hath been spoken.

3. By what, or the cause of it, and that is *by the Law*. *Law* is taken sometimes *largely* for any Doctrine revealed by God, answering the Hebrew word *Torah*, in which sense

our Saviour often quoteth it; or else more *particularly* for that preceptive part of the Scripture delivered by God unto the Jews, and is usually divided into the *Moral, Ceremonial* and *Judicial Law*. Now *Law* in the Text containeth all these kinds, and is not to be limited to the *Ceremonial* only, as some would have it.

Lastly, There is the person before whom this *Justification* is to be supposed, and that in *Gods sight*; implying, that though before men they may be justified, by walking very unblameably, yet not before God.

The second part is the Argument to confirm the Proposition, and that is drawn *a repugnantibus*, or *contrariis*; If we are justified by faith, then not by the Law; but we are justified by faith, as he proveth out of *Habakkuk*, *The just shall live by faith*. The strength of this Argument is to be considered in its time. The Observation is,

Observ. *None are justified by the Law*; or, *None can attain unto a righteousnesse by the works of the Law in Gods sight.*

None can be justified by the Law of God.

As we have already demonstrated, *That none by nature have a righteousnesse to be justified by*: So now we proceed higher, and shall evince, *That none by the knowledge of, or obedience unto the Law of God, can be justified*: For the Jew he easily thought the Heathen and uncircumcised person had nothing whereby to be accepted of by God; but for himself, he thought the Law, and the works thereof to be so glorious, that in and through them he expected reconcillation with God.

Considerations tending to clear the point.

To discover this truth, which men of corrupt mindes have greatly clouded; consider these things,

1. First, *That the Scripture useth several synonimous words or expressions, when it meneth Justification by the Law.* Sometimes the Scripture calls it the *Law of works*, Rom. 3. 27. oppositely to the *Law of Faith*, which is called a Law largely, for no more then doctrine: Now its called the *Law of works*, because it promiseth life and favour upon no other terms then working or doing; and then of works, not of one or some works, but collectively, all works that are commanded. Therefore the Apostle, immediately before in this Chapter

pter pronounceth a *curse unto every one that abideth not in all the things is requireth.* And therefore the Apostle doth emphatically call such as seek for a Justification in this way ἐξ ἔργων νόμου. They have nothing else to stand upon, they build only on this foundation, they look wholly to what they do; sometimes its expressed absolutely and simply, as here in the Text [*By the Law*] sometimes by *the Law of Moses*, Acts 13.39. sometimes by *the righteousnes of the Law*, Gal.3.21. sometimes the *Law of righteousnes*, Rom.9.31. The Jew is there reproved for *following the way of righteousnes*, sometimes a *mans own righteousnes*, Rom.10.3. And the Apostle addeth, *My own righteousnes which is of the Law*, Phil.3.9. Sometimes its said *works* simply, not works of the Law, but works in the general, therby excluding all, *Rom.*4.2. *Tit.*3.5. It is therefore good to take notice of the several expressions Gods word useth, when it denieth Justification by the Law, and the rather because every one of these expressions may obviate some subtil distinction or other that Justitiaries have brought in.

2. Therefore in the second place, that is a vain and empty distinction, which the Papists alledging *Augustine* for it, do maintain. They distinguish between *Justitia legis*, and *ex lege*, or *per legem*; The righteousnesse of the Law, and a righteousnesse from or by the Law; Righteousnesse of the Law is that which the Law requireth and commandeth; Righteousnesse by the Law, is that which a man doth by the sole direction and command of the Law without any assistance and help of grace by Christ. By this distinction *Bellarmine*, *Bererius*, and others think to salve all the Objections that are brought against their Justification by inherent righteousnesse. For whereas we urge those many Texts that do expresly deny Justification by the works of the Law, and wholly make it impossible for righteousnesse to come by it, then they immediately runne to this refuge of *Justitia legis*, and *ex lege*. But this is a roof without any foundation; for every one may observe that the Apostle useth these expressions indifferently, δικαιοῦται ἐν νόμῳ, ἐν νόμῳ, and ἐκ ἔργων νόμου, even as on the contrary δικαιοῦται πίστει, ἐκ πίστεως, διὰ πίστεως, so that as it would be an absurd thing to make a distinction of *Justitia fidei*,

dei, and *ex fide*, or *per fidem*, a righteouſneſſe *of* faith; and *from*, or *by* faith, no leſſe ridiculous is it to coin ſuch a difference about the Law. Indeed we grant, That the Law hath a righteouſneſſe it requireth, and that all believers are ſubjected to it as a rule; yea its impoſſible but that they ſhould be under the directive and preceptive power of it: God himſelf cannot diſpenſe with, or diſoblige a creature from loving him with all his heart and ſoul; yet this righteouſneſſe in the perfection of it cannot be attained unto in this life, and therefore is not to be looked upon within the circle of Juſtification. And certainly to evade ſuch pregnant places of Scripture with ſuch a brittle and aerial diſtinction as this, as to think cobwebs-harneſſe good enough to ſave againſt a Cannon-bullet.

In what ſenſe Iuſtification is denied to the works of the Law.

But becauſe great thoughts of heart, and that of the moſt learned, are in this point, *Let us particularly conſider, how and in what ſenſe Juſtification is denied to the works of the Law.* And

Firſt, *There is a groſſe and corrupt interpretation of Socinianizing ſpirits, That the Law did only require a carnal, external righteouſneſſe, and to this was promiſed only a temporal and external reward.* To this ſenſe *Grotius* upon the Text, who therefore makes the Law not able to give life, becauſe that was only converſant in an external righteouſneſſe, and terrene promiſes; and thus many have looked upon all the *Jews* in the Old Teſtament, as ſo many *Swine* feeding on huſks, and not at all acquainted with, or delighting in the pearl of Chriſt. So that by theſe Doctors, the *Law* and *Chriſt*, *works* and *faith*, ſhall be thus oppoſed; that in the Old Teſtament, all things were viſible and carnal, both duties and promiſes, no faith in Chriſt, no expectation of heaven; but now under the Goſpel, *All things are become new*, the duties more ſpiritual, and the glory expected eternal. But the Apoſtle inſtanceth in *Abraham* and *David* for the patern of our *Juſtification*, and makes their Salvation to be by *Chriſt*, as well as thoſe that have lived ſince his coming, hence all their Sacrifices did lead to Chriſt, and their general expectation was of a *Meſſias*, though generally they had earthly and carnal

nal

nal thoughts about him, *And Christ was even the end of the Law to him that believed.* This interpretation therefore may without much difficulty be exploded.

Secondly, *There are those, who say, the works of the Law, to which Justification is denied, is only of the Ceremonial Law.* And this hath had many Abettors, as if the Apostle all along in this dispute had argued onely against those that pleaded for a necessity to retain all the Ceremonial Worship, That unlesse they were circumcised, and observed dayes, and were constant in their Sacrifices, they could not be justified; and truly its no doubt but this is part of that errour which the Apostle doth so vehemently dispute against, and for which cause he cals them *beggarly elements*, Gal. 4.9. *Elements* (saith *Cameron*) because the false Teachers in their account judged them the necessary principles and foundation of Religion, as if no spirituall building could be reared, unlesse these were first laid, but yet *beggarly*, because they had no worth or dignity in them in respect of *Justification*. And it must also be granted, that as appeareth by *Acts* 15. the controversie began at first about this point meerly, *viz.* the necessity of retaining *Circumcision*, with other legall Rites; and because the necessity of them was pleaded to Justification, Therefore in the *Protract of the dispute, it brought in also all works, as well as these, even such as the Moral Law commanded.* So that the Apostle pleadeth a Justification in Christ only, or a righteousnesse of faith against all works of the Law, yea all works absolutely considered, and that it is not to be limited to the Ceremonial Law, or works thereof, appeareth

1. Because the Law, whose righteousnesse is excluded, is *that which pronounceth a curse to all that continueth not therein*, Gal. 3.10. Now this doth more properly belong unto the Moral Law, as the Apostle *James* urgeth, *Chap.* 3. *He that breaketh one is guilty of all.*

Again, The righteousnesse of the Law, which is constantly opposed to the righteousnesse of faith, is that which consists in *Do this*, Rom. 10. 5. *Do this and live.*

Now this also doth immediately belong to the Moral Law.

Further, That Law is denied in Justification, and the works of it, by which we come to know sinne, and are convinced of it; but that is chiefly and properly the Moral Law. This Argument the Apostle expresely useth, *Rom.* 3. 20. *None is justified by the works of the Law*, and this is made the reason, *Because by the Law is the knowledge of sinne.* Yea *Rom.* 7. by the Law sinne is said *to abound*, and to cause more corruptions in a man. That therefore which accidentally procureth more sinne, and so more guilt, and matter of condemnation, that cannot be a Justification to us: Now this also is the work of the Moral Law.

Again, That Law and its works is disputed against, which yet is not to be made void, is to be established; for the Apostle in all his Objections against the righteousnesse by it, doth yet still preserve the dignity of the Law that he doth not make it void. Now its plain, that its true onely of the Moral Law, for the works of the Ceremonial Law, to be Circumcised, to offer Sacrifices, &c. are not now to be done by us, because Christ the body is come; The blossoms fall, when the bud and fruit it self cometh; And therefore, though the same God, who said, *Thou shalt not kill*, said also, *Thou shalt circumcise, Thou shalt Sacrifice*, yet the commands of the former sort which are Moral, stand; but these of the later which are Ceremonial, they are abolished. Thus you see not onely a pretended righteousnesse, by observing the Ceremonial Law, but also by obedience to the Moral Law is shut out from Justification.

Thirdly, *Others therefore they are convinced, That the works of the Moral Law are excluded from Justification, but then such onely as are done by the power of nature, and strength of free-will*; As if the zeal of the Apostle were carried out only against such as should hold, that for the goodnesse of those works they did without the power and help of grace, they were justified: And thus the Papists generally, *The works* (say they) *excluded and disputed*

sputed against are such as men without the grace of Christ, being acted by their own strength solely do perform. In this Assertion they greatly triumph, thinking it no lesse then blasphemy, to deny Justification to those works that are done by the grace of God; but also, this is more particularly to be spoken to in that distinct Head, That we are not justified by works of grace under any notion or respect whatsoever; yet something must be said at present to pull this beam out of their eye.

That none can be justified by works of grace.

And first, *Those works the Gentiles and Heathens did before their knowledge and faith in Christ, could not properly be said to be the works of the Law, or to have a righteousnesse of the Law.* Now the Apostle proveth, That the *Galatians* and *Romans*, they were not justified by the works of the Law, who yet were formerly sinners of the *Gentiles*, as the Apostle expresseth it. Therefore the Apostles Argument, though it may reach the Jew; yet it would not the Gentile; for how could the Gentile think, that the works of the Law which he knew not, or heard not of, could justifie him? Therefore *Romans* 2. 12. the Apostle distinguisheth of two sorts of men, the *Jew* and the *Gentile*; The *Jew* he cals one in the Law, the *Gentile* one without the Law. If then the Gentile be one without the Law, and so without the righteousnesse of it, it cannot be imagined, that the Apostle should so industriously prove, That they were not justified by the Law, or the works of it.

Secondly, We grant indeed, *That none can be justified by the works he doth without the grace of Christ*; but the Question is, Whether the Apostle meaneth no more? Whether these are all the works that he excludeth from Justification? And we blame this Interpretation, though having some truth in it, at least in reference to the Jew, as greatly defective in respect of the Apostles main scope. By the works of the Law cannot onely be meant works done by the power of nature, without the grace of Christ, because the Apostle excludeth the works of such as were believers; Therefore its all kinde of works, as

works. This appeareth in *Abraham*, who is ſaid to be juſtified by beleeving, oppoſitely to working; Its not ſpoken of *Abraham* before his Call, and while living in Idolatry, but a long time after his knowledge of God. If then *Abrahams* works be ſhut out, when and while a beleever, yea a friend of God, How much more muſt the works of thoſe, who are in an inferiour rank? But of this more hereafter.

We ſhall inſtance in theſe *Galatians*, who are reproved for countenancing and abetting of this errour; They were not Infidels or Pagans, they had received the Goſpel, they had received the Spirit, and had ſuffered many things for the Goſpel; yet the Apoſtle tels them, That they muſt not ſeek to be juſtified by the works they yet do; The Apoſtle argueth an impoſſibility of righteouſneſſe by the Law, not meerly reſpectively to what they were once, but at any time, even ſince their converſion, as well as before their converſion. This is fully evinced by the Argument brought in the Text, *No man can be juſtified by the works of the Law*; Why? Becauſe *The juſt ſhall live by faith*: So then, even the juſt man, he who is righteous, liveth not by works, but by faith. This Argument had no conſequence at all in it, if ſo be the controverſie were underſtood of men working onely by natural power; for what is the juſt mans living by faith to a natural man acting in his meer naturals? Whereas if we ſay, The Apoſtle excludeth all works, either of unregenerate or regenerate, then this is a very powerfull Argument, becauſe the juſt man as long as he is in this world, muſt live by faith, and that in the matter of Juſtification, as well as in other things.

A man in the progreſſe of Juſtification is juſtified ſtill by faith, as well as at firſt: Hence this Text is again urged for continuance in Juſtification, as well as the entrance thereunto, *Romans* 1.17. where in the Goſpel the righteouſneſſe of God is ſaid to be revealed from faith to faith.

Fourthly, *The Apoſtle doth not exclude the works of the Law*

Law only done by nature, because this would necessarily inferre such an opinion to be held by the Galatians, that would be wholly irrational, if not impossible; for these *Galatians* did receive the Gospel, and beleeve in Christ, they did expect Justification and Salvation by these; Therefore the Apostle re-mindes them of that great joy they once took in this Doctrine of the Gospel, *Gal.* 4.15. Where is the blessednesse you once spake of? They called it a blessed Gospel, and they were blessed tidings of peace, but their zeal and fervency did abate, since they added their works to Christ. None are ever able with a raised pitch of soul to delight in Christ, that give the least *iota* or *tittle* unto works more then the Scripture requireth; Seeing therefore the *Galatians* did not raze the foundation, or wholly reject Christ, who can think that their opinion was, they could be justified by works done without him? For why did they believe in Christ still? Why did they retain and hold the Gospel for all this corrupt addition, but because they looked for Justification by Christ in part at least? Could they think they were justified without Christ, and then come to Christ to be justified? So that its to conceive an irrational, if not an impossible errour, That they who did believe in Christ for Justification at least in part, yet should at the same time think they were or might be justified by works done without Christ. And it may be said, The Apostles Arguments to the contrary were very weak, if they did not hold this, for thus he argueth, *If Justification be by the works of the Law, then Christ died in vain, then you are fallen from grace, then Christ profiteth nothing*; for how would this follow, if works of grace were excluded? for works of grace did suppose Christs death, do necessarily include grace and advantage by Christ; whereas works done solely by natural strength, did necessarily exclude Christ and grace. This (I confesse) hath some specious colour; but yet the Answer is, That such consequents of the Apostle are very strong, for even those that joyn works of grace and Christ, works of the Law, and the faith of the Gospel, do *ex natura rei*, shut Christ out of all; and although they may with their mouths and pens professe Christ and his

grace, yet really they deny both. The *Galatians* indeed did not think or intend to fall from Chriſt, yet in the nature of the thing, without repentance or recovery, they did fall from him, and deny him; for not to give Chriſt all that is due to him, to put him off with half is to make him no Chriſt at all. So that by this we ſee, its a very high ſinne, (wherein the zeal of an holy Apoſtle, otherwiſe very meek and compaſſionate) burneth as hot as fire, to put confidence in the works we do, though they be ſuppoſed works of grace we do. The Apoſtle ſaid, *If he ſhould give his body to be burnt, and have not charity, it would profit him nothing*; but if thou ſhouldſt give thy body to be burnt, and have charity, and that in a great meaſure, yet if thou put any truſt in this, thou denieſt Chriſt, and makeſt him to die in vain. Indeed there are men who cannot be guilty of this ſinne, for none ever thought to be juſtified by the works of ſinne, and the devil: But there are others again attending to the works of righteouſneſſe, and they may quickly ſwallow down this poyſon: Therefore let them take heed of eſtabliſhing to themſelves a falſe righteouſneſſe, a *Dagon* that can never ſtand before God.

SERM. XXII.

That Justification cannot be attained by the Works of the Law.

GAL. 3. 11.

But that no man is Justified by the Law in the sight of God, it is evident: For the Just shall live by Faith.

WE have hitherto shewed what Exposition is made of *the works of the Law*, and whether in whose or in part such interpretations are to be rejected: and what other senses are given in this matter, may be reduced to one of those heads. As that of *Castellio, De Justif. p.* 27. when he saith, He dare boldly make this distinction between the righteousnesse of the Law, and that of faith; The righteousnesse of the Law is an external obedience coming from a servile fear; The righteousnesse of faith a virtue of the minde contrary to vice, which God gives freely to those that beleeve, pardoning their by-past sins.

Let us therefore consider in the next place, *why Justification cannot be by the Law, or righteousnesse attained by the works of it.* And

Reasons why the works of the Law cannot justifie.

1.

First, *Because the righteousnesse of the Law requireth an universal perfection in the subject who is thereby justified.* Rom. 10. The righteousnesse thereof is in *Do this and live. Do this*] yea this, and this, and all in every *iota* or *tittle*, or else there

is

is no life. Therefore such a Justification as this was onely possible to *Adam* while he continued in his integrity. Christ (say some) was justified in this manner by the works he did, and then the Angels they were justified by their faithfull continuance in obedience to God. Now then, if there be not one man to be found since *Adams* fall, that can plead righteousnesse by a [*Do this*] then he must seek for Justification some other way. This is so evident, that howsoever Papists generally go another way, yet *Cajetan Comment. in 3. ad Rom.* maketh this difference between the righteousnesse of God, and the righteousnesse of the Law. The righteousnes of God (saith he to this effect) is that whereby a man is absolutely accounted of as just, both in respect of what is past, as also what is present and to come. The righteousnesse of the Law is that whereby a man for the present and to come, is accepted of as just, but for the sinnes past that cannot give a righteousnesse. There is some truth in this; for suppose that there were such an infusion of righteousnesse into us, that thereby we are inabled to keep the Law of God perfectly, yet how shall we do for a righteousnes for our by-past waies, before this infusion was? *Cajetan* therefore in this respect saith right, That the righteousnesse of God, which is the same with the righteousnesse of faith and the Gospel, is that whereby we are looked upon as just before God, in respect of our former conversation. But this can never be by the Law, for that requireth a perfection from the first to the last. To have once sinned, and but once, though a man could be immediatly restored unto integrity again, is to make the righteousnes of the Law impossible to us; So that righteousnes by the Law, though once possible, yet to us accidently by our corruption is impossible; and therefore in this life, while we have the reliques of corruption, we are to cry out: Oh miserable, naked and poor creatures, as we are! Who will help us to a righteousnesse to cover our nakednesse?

2. Secondly, *Justification cannot be by the Law, because the Scripture makes Justification by faith and the Law two immediate contraries.* If we are justified by faith, we cannot be by the Law; The East and the West may be as soon brought together,

as

as these two kindes of Justifications. This Argument is prest by the Apostle in my Text, and the verse following, *The Law is not of faith*; and *Rom.* 10. The righteousnesse of the Law, and the righteousnesse of faith are made two immediate opposites. The Scripture then alwayes speaking of these two, as diametrically opposite, it must necessarily follow between the Law and faith, as Christ said of God and Mammon, *You cannot serve God and Mammon*; so neither can you have the righteousnesse of the Law and faith together; you may as well serve two contrary Masters, as enjoy these two contrary righteousnesses. Therefore the endeavours of such who would make a righteousnesse compounded of the Law and faith, is as vain as those who would build *Jericho* again; and indeed the very nature of them is as immediately contrary as light and darknesse, and as inconsistent as the Arctique and Antarctique Pole, for the righteousnesse of faith supposeth me altogether miserable, wretched in sinne, and naked in my self; The righteousnesse of the Law supposeth perfection and all fulnesse in me; Now how can a man be both these at the same time?

Thirdly, *Righteousnesse cannot come by the Law, because that curseth every man by nature, and so is a minister of wrath and condemnation.* This Argument the Apostle urged in the verse before my Text, *As many as are of the works of the Law, are under a curse*: Why? *Because it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them.* We may then as well expect water from the fire, and sweetnesse out of gall, as righteousnesse by the Law; he that runneth to this as a refuge, when Gods anger pursueth him, doth as the man the Prophet speaks of that leaned on the wall, and the Serpent bit him. Alas, when Conscience and Justice shall arraign thee, wilt thou plead the Law? That wil heap up thy wrath more, that will add more stings to thy guilt. Its observable that *Deut.* 27. 26. when this was pronounced, *Cursed is he that continueth not in all the words of the Law to do them*, the people were to say, *Amen*: what was this but to ratifie the curse against themselves, onely hereby they were taught to go out of themselves, and to renounce all that

3.

righteousnesse they gloried in, and to seek to him in whom all *the promises are Amen*, because in the Law all the curses are *Amen*.

4. Fourthly, *Righteousnesse cannot come by the Law, because we are justified by an imputed righteousnesse, whereas the Law requireth a personal inherent righteousnesse.* This seemeth to be very cogent, for whereas with Popish Writers, the righteousnesse of the Law and of the Gospel differ onely *secundum magis* and *minus*, as an Acorn and an Oak, a childe and a man, the one imperfect, the other more perfect; its evident by Scripture that these two righteousnesses differ *specie*, and so cannot by any addition ever be made the same; yea the more perfect and compleat our righteousnesse personal and inherent would be, the lesse imputed it would be, and so be the farther off from a Gospel-righteousnesse. Now that our righteousnesse is an imputed righteousnesse, appeareth by the frequent affirmation of it by *Paul*, and that in one Chapter, *Rom.* 4. and hence also the same Apostle would *be found in Christ, not having his own righteousnesse which is of the Law*, *Phil.* 3. Yea 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. we are said to be *made the righteousnesse of God in him*. If then Christ be our righteousnesse, if his obedience be reckoned as ours, then this is as far distant from a legal righteousnesse as heaven from earth. But of this more in its due time, because this imputed righteousnesse is the great thing controverted.

5. Fifthly, *If the righteousnesse of the Law justifieth, then Christ died in vain, then grace is abolished, then Christ is become of no effect unto a believer.* These are consequences the Apostle himself makes; and although a *Galatian* might have replied, The consequence is denied, for we beleeve in Christ, we hold him also necessary to Justification, and faith in him, as well as the works of the Law, yet would not this have satisfied *Paul*, because if Christ be not wholly received for Justification, he is not received at all. Christ was not made part of righteousnesse unto us, but righteousnesse in the whole. And indeed it must needs be a great debasing of Christ, to make his death and sufferings a co-partner only with our works, that Christ with us should make up a compleat Saviour. This is so gross

an

an absurdity, that learned Protestants, affirming the Pope to be Antichrist, when assaulted with this Objection, That they believe Christ to be come in the flesh; They believe Christ to be God and man; Its answered, Because they deny Christ in his Offices, especially in this matter of Justification by him, joyning works with him, that therefore they may be properly said to deny him. Furthermore upon this account, Christ would have died in vain, if righteousnesse could come by the Law, for to what purpose did Christ bring a righteousnesse, if the Law had brought it before? *Yea*, if this were so, then the contrary to what the Apostle affirmeth, it would prove true, *viz.* That the Law did invalidate and disanull the Covenant of Grace. Look not then upon this errour as meer hay or stubble: No, it cometh too near razing the foundation it self: For although some learned men in this point have laboured, if not to reconcile Protestants and Papists, yet to make it doubtfull, Whether the Church of *Rome* hold a fundamental errour? (*Hooker Eccles. Polit. in Treat. of Justi.*) yet if we consider the Apostles zeal, and his Arguments which he useth against the *Galatians*, who yet did believe in Christ; The Weme seemeth so big that the breasts of charity cannot cover it, yea that is a Cancer rather which eateth up the life of Christianity.

Sixthly, *If righteousnesse could come by the Law, then it would by one of these three wayes, either because we are able perfectly to fulfill the Law by a personal righteousnesse, or because the Law condescends from its perfect exactnesse, and requireth no more then we can do; or though we cannot perfectly obey the Law, yet God will account of, and accept this imperfect obedience, as if it were perfect.* But neither of these three wayes can righteousnesse be communicated unto us; not from the first, for he only fulfilleth the Law, that is always without sinne, that never committed the least iniquity. Hence the Apostle *John* saith, 1 *John* 1. 10. *If we say we have no sinne, we make God a liar, and there is no truth in us.* The Papist therefore makes God and his Apostle *John* a liar in this particular. The Law requireth a total perfection, a graduall perfection, and this continually, a perfection *subjective*, *objective* and *adjunctive*, 6.

adjunctive, that *Do this and live*, is a thunderbolt to strike down every man; None is able to stand before it, *For in many things we offend all*, and what we do comes not up to the perfection of the rule, and whatsoever is *minus quam esse debet, ex vitio est*, as *Augustine*. They must therefore have low thoughts of the Laws perfection, who have such high thoughts of their own graces.

2. It cannot be that the Law abateth of its exactnesse, and commensurateth it self to our power, for thus many say, The Law is not such an hard task-master as many make it: Its not such a strict immovable Rule, but like *Paul*, *It becomes all things to all men*; it descends to the power and capacity of man, and is no further obligable then mans power doth extend it self: But *Paul*, Rom. 7. doth acknowledge the spirituality and holinesse of the Law; The obliging power of that, even then when he found nothing *but evil present with him*; and *David* doth often commend the perfection of the Law, because it requireth what is every way necessary, not being deficient in any thing: Now seeing its our duty to have what *Adam* lost, and he losing such an admirable perfection, God requireth this of us still; The debt is due, though we are bankrupts and cannot pay it. Do not then bring down the Law to thy power, but acknowledge thy duty by the Rule; The Rule continueth a Rule, though thou art not able to attain unto it. Indeed sometimes the godly are said *to keep the Commandments, and to walk unblameably therein*, but that is in respect of sincerity, and because of their study and endeavour after perfection. Its true, the whole heart is sometimes opposed to hypocrisie, and a double heart; but when its joyned with those Concomitants, *to love God with all the heart, all the soul, and all thy strength*; This requireth more then any man can do in this life: especially that the Law obligeth beyond our power, is plain, because we still have sinne in us, lusts and sinnefull motions, as the Apostle complaineth *Rom.* 7. Now if these were not forbidden by the Law, they could not be sins, for *where there is no Law there is no transgression*.

Thirdly and lastly, *what is imperfect God doth not own as perfect*.

perfect. This is an evasion which some later Writers much applaud themselves in, they acknowledge, That we are not able to fulfill the Law, they confesse we break it in many things; but then they adde, *God doth graciously through Christ forgive our imperfections, and accepteth of this, as if it were the fulfilling of the Law.* Now indeed we grant, That the obedience of the godly, though very drosse, and accompanied with many imperfections, yet through Christ is accepted of, and God looks upon them as true and upright men, not hypocrites and prophane; but yet for all this, they are not accepted to Justification; We cannot say, That by these we are justified, for that were to make God to pronounce otherwise then the truth is; How can they be accounted Just by that which is not exactly Justice? Gods Judgement *is* alwayes according to truth, and he doth not judge of things otherwise then they are. Now if God should account of these as satisfying the Law, and answering the perfection of it when they do not, it would suppose errour or mistake in God.

Thus you have heard, That righteousnesse cannot be obtained by the works of the Law, yet to what hath been delivered, its necessary to adde some *Cautions*; for even *Paul* when he preached this Doctrine was traduced by his enemies, and they inferred many false consequences, gathering thorns of the vine, and thistles of the fig-tree.

First therefore, *Though Justification be not by the righteousnesse of the Law, yet this is not to condemn it, to make it an uselesse thing, as if there was no wisdome or goodnesse of God seen in the manifestation of it.* No such matter, We see the Apostle with great indignation rejects such inferences; yea *Rom.* 7. he giveth this commendation of the Law, *That it is holy and spirituall*, laying the whole blame upon himself, *He was carnal and sold under sinne*; distinguish then between that which floweth from the Law *per se*, and of its own nature, and that which cometh from it by accident, and through our own corruption. Thus it is, The Law was at first given to *Adam* to justifie him by the works thereof; It would have given life to him; This was the proper

and intended end of it; but upon mans rebellion, whole mankinde is plunged into all sin, and so no more able to obey this Law, then blinde men see, or dead men walk. The Law therefore finding us such, is so farre from communicating a righteousnesse to us, that it aggravateth our sinne, making it out of measure sinfull, and filling us with wrath and guilt; it is we and not the Law that are to be condemned; Excellent food is not to be condemned, but the corrupted stomack that cannot digest, yea which increaseth its disease by it.

Secondly, *This is not so to be understood, as if the Law were wholly abrogated, and of no use to us.* It continueth as a Rule, though not as a Covenant by which we are to be justified. Thus the Apostle denieth *that he makes void the Law*, Rom. 3. 13. *Yea we establish the Law*; Therefore the Apostle, even when he so vehemently argueth against Justification by the Law, doth yet presse the duty of the Law. It is one thing to love God, to delight in him, to walk in his Commandments, and another thing to expect Justification by them: This is to mingle heaven and earth, when we confound Justification and Sanctification: So that the works of the Law may be considered two wayes, either in respect of the Command or Direction of the Law to which we are enabled by the Spirit of God sanctifying us; and in this sense we preach the Law, we command the works of the Law, and desire God would write his Law in your inward parts.

But then the works of the Law may be secondly considered as the Conditions of our Justification, and whosoever looketh on them thus, he rejects Christ and his grace. This is a dangerous errour, when we do the works of the Law for this end, when we love God, endevour to keep his Commandments, that thereby God may pronounce us righteous.

Hence in the third place, *We must distinguish between the works of that righteousnesse which the Law requireth, and the righteousnesse of works.* All the people of God ought it their businesse to abound in the works of righteousnesse. The Scripture commands and encourageth the servants of God in it

it doth as much condemn a righteousnesse of works. We have a remarkable expression, *Deut.* 6.25. *It shall be our righteousnesse, if we observe to do all that God commandeth us*; our righteousnesse, not our righteousnesse to justifie us, but a *qualitative righteousnesse* to denominate us so inherently, according to that, *He that doth righteousnesse is righteous*, 1 Joh. 3.7. Let not then this Doctrine discourage from that righteousnesse of life the Law requireth; Say not, What have we to do with the Law and Sanctification? For although it be not appointed to justifie, yet it is commanded as the way we should walk in; yea the Law is not onely a directive Rule, but accidentally a School-master to bring to Christ; For when by that we are convinced of sinne, and have nothing but despair in our selves, this driveth us out to Christ, and though it cannot be our *Do this and live*, yet Christs *Do* procureth eternal life; Though we are not justified by our works, yet we are by Christs, and whatsoever the Scripture denieth to us it attributeth to him.

Fourthly, *It cannot be denied but that it is a very hard thing to presse the Law as a Rule of righteousnesse, and not to have it looked upon as a Covenant by which we are made righteous.* What should we be bound to follow holinesse, and yet not for this to be justified before God? Hence this confidence in the works we do hath been a sinne of old in the Church; The Prophets did most zealously rebuke it, and we see in the beginning of the Christian Church, what entertainment it had both doctrinally and practically. Now what was formerly done in reference to the commands of the Law, is still generally with us respectively to Gospel-duties: Are there not hundreds to one Christian that fiducially rest upon their Christian performances, that look not to Christs righteousnesse in their duties? Now to such we may say, You who seek to be justified by the duties of the Gospel, you fall from grace, and Christ is become of no effect unto you. This sin is like a moth secretly consuming many thousand without any noise. If the Apostle charge some not *to trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God*; How much more not to put confidence in thy works but in Christ, for this spiritual confidence

fidence in works for Juſtification, is greater Idolatry then truſting in wealth, becauſe hereby we reſt on them for that which is more directly and immediately Gods work, for God only forgiveth ſin, and juſtifieth a man at his Tribunal; and truly, why ſhould there be ſuch voluminous diſputations for that righteouſneſſe to juſtifie, when the greateſt patrons thereof at the cloſe finde a miſgiving of their hearts? as *Bellarmines* known *Tutiſſimum eſt*, and *Suarez* (*Diſput. de orat.*) adviſeth him that prayeth, not to think of, or mention his merits in prayer, *ob periculum ſuperbiæ* for fear of pride; what is this but to provide a potion for the diſeaſed, and then to prohibit the taking it for fear of killing him?

Uſe of Inſtruction. How bleſſed a thing it is to be directed in this point of Juſtification, to be aſſured what is that righteouſneſſe God will own; Satan hath alwayes by his inſtruments endeavoured to take away the live childe, and put a dead one in the room. Let that be thought a matter of great moment, in which the Apoſtle ſheweth ſo much zeal. As the *Pſalmiſt* ſaid, *Some put their truſt in chariots, and ſome in horſes, but we will in the name of God*; So let us, ſome put confidence in the Law, ſome in their duties, ſome in good works, ſome in faith, ſome in both, but we will truſt in Chriſt, who is *the Lord our righteouſneſſe*; Every thing in the Temple was to be covered with gold, and thus we are *to put on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, that nothing of our nakedneſſe may appear, *but Chriſt may be all in all*; live not, die not, but in this covering.

Serm. XXIII.

That the Works of a Godly man done gratiously, are not the Condition or a Causa sine qua non *of his Justification.*

1 Cor. 4. 4.

For I know nothing by my self, yet am I not hereby Justified.

At the close of the precedent Chapter, the Apostle seemed to depresse the Office of Christs Ministry in the Church too much, making Apostles and Officers to be servants to the Church, and wholly in reference to it. Lest therefore this should puff up private beleevers, and make them undervalue or contemn their Officers, he giveth necessary counsel, *ver.* 1. in this matter: for when the Authority of Church-Officers is despised, then confusion and licentiousnes breaks forth. [*Let a man*] that is, every man (an Hebraism) of what rank or dignity soever, though of never such abilities and graces, *Account*, λογιζέσθω, that is to account upon an exact and judicious comparing of things together. There ought to be a serious and well-grounded esteem of them.

Then there is the cause or ground of this account, and that is described in such properties that denote the Ministers dignity, and yet his duty; his duty in that they are ὑπηρέται, *Ministers*, the word doth not signifie every kinde of service, but that which is most toilsom and laborious, a Metaphor taken

from those that row in a boat, so great a care is required in them to bring the ship of Christ safe to the haven; They are also οἰκονομοὶ *Stewards*, not *Lords* or *Masters*, nor called to idlenesse and vanity in the world. Thus all the names given to Christs Officers they are names of labour more then honour, yet in the second place, There is their dignity also, *Ministers of Christ; and Stewards of the mysteries of God*; What can be more sublime and glorious then this, to be workers with God for mens salvation!

Having thus declared what men ought to esteem of the Ministers of God, he thereupon sheweth how little he is moved with the thoughts men had of him. Mans judgment is called in the Greek, *his day*, as among the Latins *diem dicere*: Though *Hierom* thought this a phrase peculiar to the *Ciliciani*, yet the learned shew that it is an Hebraism. Now the Apostle doth the rather slight mens judgements, because he had a good conscience in the discharge of his Office.

So that in the words you have *Pauls* Justification of himself, as to men, and his disclaim of any Justification thereby, as to God. His Justification before men, is in these words, *I know nothing by my self*; which is not universally to be understood, as if he knew no sinne at all in himself; for *Rom. 7.* he makes sad complaints of corruptions working in him, but he speaks it *quoad hoc*, in respect of his Ministry he had not been an unfaithfull *Steward of Divine Mysteries*, he was not guilty of any crimes that his adversaries could charge him with; and although he expresseth it negatively (he knew nothing by himself) yet that supposeth a positive and sincere course of his life, both in respect of his Ministry and otherwayes. But lest this should seem arrogancy and spiritual pride, he renounceth all Justification by the works he did, *yet am I not hereby justified.*

Grotius limits the sense too much, as if Justification doth denote only freedom from sinne; and in another place speaks superciliously (*Proleg. in Epist. ad Rom.*) as if none before him had hit right upon the Explication of the word in *Pauls* Epistle to the *Romans*. But in its time, I shall make good, That Justification is more then a bare remission of sin.

In

In the last place we have a reason given why *Paul* is not justified by what he did, because the Lord judgeth him, he who knoweth more sinfulnesse and corruption by man then the most Eagle-eyed Christian can discern, God is greater then our hearts, and so is acquainted with those errours and failings that the most tender-hearted Christian cannot take notice of.

This place doth not prove an uncertainty of Justification, as the Papists would inferre; for they grant, That *Paul* knew assuredly by revelation that he was a justified person, onely it strongly evinceth, That *Paul*, and so no man regenerate is justified by any good works he doth in this life; and so whereas many would evade the power of several places of Scripture, That only works of the Law, or such as are done by our own strength, are excluded: This place is stronger then *Samsons* new cords, it holds the adversaries so fast, that they know not how to wrest themselves loose.

That even the most holy and regenerate man is not justified by the works of grace which he doth. Observ.

This truth is the more diligently to be asserted, by how much the errour that confronts it is more specious and refined, and maintained by such abettors, whose repute is not so easily cast off, as the former we spake of. And that we may keep to the proper point in hand, take notice,

First, *That the Question is not, Whether we are justified by works; though flowing from grace as meritorious or efficient of Justification?* This the Opinionists we have to deal with, do reject with indignation. To make works either merits or efficient causes of our Justification before God, they grant, is directly to oppose the Scriptures, yea they seem to be offended with the Orthodox, as giving too much to faith, because it is made an instrument of our Justification, therefore they are to be acquitted at least from grosse Popery.

Secondly, *Although to maintain faith and obedience to be the conditions, and a causa sine quâ non of our Justification, be the professed and avowed doctrine of the Socinians*, yet some of late have asserted the same doctrine, *that yet abhorre Socinianisme*; for the *Socinians* deny Christs Satisfaction, and his

Righteouſneſſe in fulfilling of the Law for us, and ſo make good works a condition of our Juſtification, not through and for Chriſt a Mediator, but from the meer grace of God (as they expreſſe it) who hath no ſuch juſtice as to need a ſatisfaction by an atonement through Chriſts bloud. Though therefore theſe later ſort of Writers aſſert the ſame thing with *Socinians*, yet upon different grounds.

3. Thirdly, Neither is the Queſtion about *the neceſſity of holineſſe and ſanctification in thoſe that are juſtified; Juſtified perſons will abound in the fruits of holineſſe, that ſweet fountain within will alſo bring forth ſweet ſtreams; This good tree will bear good fruit*; onely the Queſtion is, *Upon what account theſe are required in juſtified perſons? Whether in ſome cauſality or concurrence as faith is, onely not with ſuch a degree of excellency? Whether good works be required as well as faith, ſo that we may ſay, Juſtifying Repentance, Juſtifying Law, as well as Juſtifying Faith?* This is poſitively and vehemently affirmed by ſome, but certainly thoſe Arguments and Reaſons they bring are too weak to gain-ſay the torrent of Orthodox Divines. Its good to ſail between *Antinomianiſm* on the one hand, and this errour on the other hand; and while we profligate one errour, not to runne into another extream. This therefore I ſhall (God willing) undertake to prove, That good works are not Conditions, or *à cauſa ſine quâ non* of our Juſtification; and although the Abettors of this opinion do give faith the preheminence, and make it the principal condition, yet if they will rigidly ſtand to the Apoſtle *James* his words, (which they ſay, they are much awed with) faith muſt be leſſe principal, and works be that which giveth life to faith, that it may be inabled to juſtifie; and thus indeed it is affirmed, That works make faith alive, as to the attainment of its end of Juſtification. But of this more when we ſhall ſhew the inconſiſtency of Authours with their own ſelves, in anſwering their great Objection taken from the Apoſtle *James*.

I proceed therefore to ſhew, *That no godly man is juſtified by his works, or works though done graciouſly, yet are not the condition of a mans Juſtification, as faith is.* And

First,

First, I shall instance in the great patern and example of our Justification, *Abraham*, from whom the Apostle concludeth a Justification of all believers in the like manner he was. Now that *Abraham* was not justified by works, or his working, though a godly man, the Apostle makes it his whole businesse to prove, *Rom.* 4. 3, 4, 5. This place is judged by the Orthodox to be very pregnant for Justification without works, even those of a regenerate or godly man; for *Abraham*, though a godly man, and *the Father of the faithfull*, yet even then when he was godly, was not justified by any works he did, but by faith. This place is the more to be insisted upon, because its the proper seat of Justification. The Apostles scope is expresly to determine how a man is justified, and no learned Lawyer was ever more carefull to put in many words in the Deeds that he makes, to exclude all cavils and shifts for the future, then was this divine Apostle diligent to shut out all erroneous glosses, insomuch that we may despair of satisfying that man, who is not convinced from this example. For *Bellarmine* who useth not to be very ingenuous, doth acknowledge that this is *gravis difficultas*, for *Abrahams* works are excluded while he was godly, and in the state of grace. Though this mountain be so strong, yet there are those who set their shoulders to heave it away. What the Papists answer, I shall not much matter, but what others more refined do bring in, is worthy consideration. *The works* (say they) *that are excluded, are works of the Law; the Law requiring a perfect personal righteousnesse, cannot be fulfilled by any, only Christ satisfied that, and those that we might be partakers of this righteousnesse, faith and good works are required as conditions, so that the works of the law are excluded, not of the Gospel.* But this cannot be a solid answer.

I.

1. Because the Apostle speaketh generally of works in this description of Justification, though in other places he sometimes saith, the works of the Law, yet *Abraham* could not be instanced in for such works, and therefore the Apostle speaks universally of works, *qua* works: Certainly, as they say, its not fit for us to teach the Spirit of God what to say. So

this is good counsel in this particular. When we reade that the holy Ghost speaks generally of all works, Who are we that we should limit it to some? The Apostle then nameth works, when he treateth on purpose, how we are justified and excluded: them; and this is the more cogent, if we consider the opposition between faith and works. The Apostle directly opposeth the believer and the work, which could never be if Gospel-works were not excluded; nay by this means there could be no contradistinction at all, because faith it self, if considered in Justification as a condition only its respected as a work. How then could the Apostle make such an immediate contrariety between these two? By their interpretation, the believer should be opposed only to some kinde of works and faith, not to all, but to some kinde of works, which if so, the Apostles Argument had then no necessary consequence.

Again, That works of all sort are excluded, is plain, if you consider the object of Justification, who it is that is here said to be justified, and that is the ungodly. By the ungodly is one meant that hath not a sufficient and adequate holinesse, so that *Abraham*, though regenerated, yet as to Justification, is ungodly, he cannot stand before God to endure, if all his imperfections are enquired after. Now certainly, he that fulfilleth the conditions of Justification cannot be called ungodly, for he doth all that which is required: So that this is very considerable, that all those whom God justifieth, he justifieth them not for any thing they have of their own, or any conditions they have performed, but as such who are sinners in a strict examination, and so deserve condemnation, and therefore no works of grace are looked upon.

Lastly, That all works are excluded, is evident by the Apostles allegation out of *David*, who makes mans blessednesse to be in this, That God imputeth righteousnesse without works. Who can perswade himself that *David* excluded only works of the Law, when in his time, that Question which so perplexed the Christian Church in its infancy, was not started? So that the Apostle making this righteousnesse to be imputed, and that without works, doth counsel a man

to exclude all works whatsoever in this great point of Justification; and indeed it is at last confessed, That its faith onely which makes the contract between God and the soul. That good works are not required to this initial consenting unto Christ, so as to make him ours, but in the progresse. This is that in effect, which the Papists affirm in other words, That the first Justification is onely by faith, but the second by good works.

Against this general exclusion of all works is opposed, *ver.* 4. where the Apostle saith, *To him that worketh the reward is of debt*, from whence they gather, That works onely which are debts, are excluded: But if this be seriously thought on, it makes strongly against them; for the Apostles Argument is *a genere*, if it be by works, its of debt. Therefore there are not works of debt, and works of no debt. This supposition would make the Apostle to argue infinitely and weakly: If our works be of grace and imperfect, then to them the reward is reckoned of debt, though not so much as if they were fully perfect. Neither will it avail to say, That these Gospel-graces cannot be debt, because Gods Spirit inableth us thereunto: For if a man (as *Paraeus* well urgeth) set two labourers on work, and to one he lends his tools to work, the other brings his own tools, at the close of the day both receive their wages for their labour, not of debt, though one had his tools given him.

2. The second Argument may be from the peculiar and expresse difference that the Scripture giveth between faith and other graces, in respect of Justification: So that faith and good works are not to be considered as concurrent in the same manner, though one primarily, the other secondarily; so that if faith when its said to justifie, doth it not as a condition, but in some other peculiar notion, which works are not capible of, then we are not justified by works as well as faith. Now its not lightly to be passed over, That the Scripture still useth a peculiar expression of *Faith*, which is incommunicable to other graces. Thus *Rom.* 3. 25. Remission of sinnes is *through faith in his blood*, Rom. 4. 5. *Faith is counted for Righteousnesse*, Rom. 5. 1. Gal. 2. 16. and in many other

other places, still the expression is, *Justified by faith; Christ dwels in the heart by faith*, Ephes. 3. Believing is *receiving of Christ*, Joh. 1. Act. 10. 43. *Remission of sinnes is received by faith*, Act. 26. 18. Gal. 3. 14. *The promise of the Spirit is received by faith*: Insomuch that as Christ is the Serpent exalted, so faith is the eying of the Serpent, whereby we are healed: That as the meer looking upon the Serpent cured without any other medicinal helps and endeavours: Thus the meer believing on Christ doth justifie without other works co-operating therein.

From these expressions it is that our Orthodox Divines do say, That faith justifieth as its an instrument, laying hold on Christ, so that Christ received by faith is properly that which justifieth, not faith it self, or any dignity in it. This is the hand that receiveth the jewel, which doth enrich us. This Doctrine, though so generally received and avowed by all Protestant Writers, yet of late is rejected among other reasons, *Because there cannot be any passive instrument*. Now I much wonder that *Bellarmine*, *Becanus*, and other subtil Jesuites that turned every stone to overthrow faiths instrumentality in Justification, should so farre forget their Logick and Metaphysicks, as not to pitch upon this Objection above all, that there cannot be any such thing as a passive instrument. Truly I think, when a man of godly affections broacheth an errour, which he taketh to be a truth, he himself is a passive instrument to bring others into errours. If we regard natural causes and moral, we may easily mention many passive instruments: In *natural things* the *throat* is a passive instrument of drinking. The *Conduit-pipe* of conveying water, and twenty such instances men may think of. In *morality*, taking that largely, there are many passive instruments, *Nebuchadnezzar* and all wicked men are Gods passive instruments. The Serpent by which the Devil deceived *Eve*, was a passive instrument: and to come nearer to our purpose, Who can deny but that *miraculous faith* was a passive instrument in doing miracles, for the power of working miracles is infinite, and could not be communicated to a creature no more then the Creation of a world, onely they by resting on Gods power,

God

God wrought these wonderful things by them. But nothing doth so fully represent this, as the opinion of *Aristotle* and others following him, that *intelligere* is *pati*, and so *videre*, *audire*, are *pati*, to understand is to receive, and so to see and hear; the soul doth these by those faculties which are passive instruments therein; and therefore when *Bellarmine* would prove, That *credere* and *apprehendere* were actions and works; Its well answered, That to believe or to lay hold on Christ (The Greek word applied often to faith is λαμβάνειν) Though they be Grammatical actions, yet they are naturally passions, as *intelligere*, *videre*, are active verbs according to Grammar, but naturally and physically are passions: So that a man in believing is passive, that is, he receiveth Christ for his righteousnesse: But of a passive instrument more hereafter. Justification is not in giving something to God, but in receiving from him; we do not curiously litigate about the word instrument; by *instrumentum* we mean no more then *medium*, whereby the soul receiveth the Gospel-righteousnesse tendred unto it, and those peculiar expressions you heard the Scripture giveth to faith, can evince no lesse. If therefore faith justifie upon a peculiar reason, That that grace onely hath, *viz.* because it receiveth and applieth Christ our righteousnesse, then other graces and holy works, having no such capacity cannot justifie. As the hand onely, not the eyes or the feet, are the instrument that take almes given to a poor man. This consideration made that learned man Mr *Ball*, say, How faith and works should be conjoyned as concauses in Justification is impossible to conceive. *Treat. of the Cov. of Grace*, p. 70. And its a meer Sophism to say, That if by faith we receive Christ, and faith is the receiving of Christ, then we receive Christ by receiving; for its not the notion of faith, that is properly the instrument receiving, but faith as the habit putting it self into act. So that the meaning is, faith acting or laying hold upon Christ, is the instrument receiving him. Neither is this to give too much to faith, no more then in the faith of miracles, when Christ said to some, *Thy faith hath made thee whole*, that thereby our Saviour gave any dignity to faith, as if that were the cause of their health.

3. The third *Argument* is, *If in the continuance and progresse of our Justification, we are justified after the same manner we were at first, then its not by faith and works, but by faith only as distinct to works.* The strength of this Argument lieth in this, Its granted, The first consent and willingnesse to receive Christ, is that which justifieth, and good works are required by co-operation thereunto, as opportunity serveth: So that (by the way) it must be confessed, That faith in some doth justifie them antecedently to good works, and that some may be so prevented, that their faith could not co-operate with their works; and how will this agree with that discourse they form out of the Apostle *James, Chap.* 2? But that which I pursue by this Argument is, That in the same manner we were at first justified, we are alwayes justified: But its granted, We are not at first justified by works; Therefore not afterwards. Now this truth, That we are justified at first, as afterwards, will appear by these two Texts of Scripture, *Rom.* 1. 17. where *the righteousnesse of God* is said *to be revealed from faith to faith.* Not to mention the severall descants of many upon this place. That which the most solid Interpreters pitch upon is, That in our Justification we begin with faith, and go on in faith; its from faith and to faith, as parallel expressions from *strength to strength, from glory to glory.* Therefore the Apostles sense is, That in our Justification we proceed not from faith to works, as these must hold, that make works the secondary condition of our Justification, but *from faith to faith;* by faith we began, and by faith we continue. The second Text is, from the place formerly insisted on, *Gal.* 3. 11. where the Apostle proveth, *A just man is not justified by the works of the Law, because he liveth by faith;* If then in the progresse of our Justification we live by faith on Christ, then are we not justified by works, for why might it not be said as well according to the contrary opinion, That we are justified by works, because the just shall live by his works? But I think this would be very harsh to any tender ear. Neither will that *crambe* not *bis,* but *decies cocta* avail, That works of the Law onely are excluded; for works of the Law may be so called, either *quoad efficientiam,* as if the Law could enable us to what is good,

or

or *quoad nervum*, in respect of the regulative part of it, and thus all the works that regenerate men do, are works of the Law; if they do *not murder*, if they *keep the Sabbath*, if they *take God for their God*, and so put confidence in him. This is a work of the Law; and in this sense *Paul* said, *He delighted in the Law of God in the inward man*. And thus that Evangelical Righteousnesse they speak of, is legal in this sense, that is, its according to the rule of the Law: Consider therefore this seriously, take heed of beginning in faith, and ending in works; Do thou go on from *faith to faith*, not from believing to doing.

SERM. XXIV.

More Arguments to prove the former Position.

1 COR. 4. 4.

For I know nothing by my self, yet am I not hereby Justified.

WE proceed to a fourth Argument by which it is to be proved, *That we are not justified by works as a condition, or a* Cause sine quâ non, and thus it is propounded,

He that is justified by fulfilling a Condition, though he be thereunto inabled by Grace, yet he is just and righteous in himself. But all justified persons as to Justification are not righteous in themselves, but in Christ their Surety and Mediator. I say, They are righteous as to Justification in their own persons, 4.

who fulfill the Conditions of Justification. But the justified person in the Gospel-way, though he have a *qualitative righteousnesse*, whereby he is truly and *inherently just*; yet as to a righteousnesse of Justification, that is not his own, but anothers; Even the righteousnesse of the Lord Christ received and made his by faith; Two particulars are comprized in this Argument, and both of them seem so evident, that they need not much proving.

1. *That he which fulfils a Condition on which Justification depends, is righteous in himself; for seeing no more is required but this Condition, and that is supposed to be performed by the man that worketh; Therefore he must needs be righteous in himself; for though this righteousnesse be originally from Grace, yet it is subjectively a mans righteousnesse:* So that we may call it *a mans own righteousnesse*, as *Paul* doth *Phil.*3. and *the works of righteousnesse which we do*, Tit. 3.5. So that as the temporal mercies which are given of God to us, we call our own, our own health, our own wealth: Thus the holy graces which we act, though inabled to them by Gods Spirit, and so efficiently are the fruits thereof, yet subjectively and formally, they are our own, our own faith, and our own repentance: So that if we fulfill these Conditions, we are righteous as to Justification by that which is our own and inherent in us: yea, I think, if it be well weighed, it will be found to be a contradiction, to say they are Conditions, and yet a *Causa sine qua non*, of our Justification: for a *Causa sine quâ non* is no cause at all; but a Condition in a Covenant strictly taken, hath a moral efficiency, and is a *Causa cum quâ*, not a *Causa sine quâ non*. If *Adam* had stood in his integrity, though that confirmation would have been of grace, yet his works would have been a causal Condition of the blessednesse promised: In the Covenant of Grace, though what man doth is by the gift of God, yet look upon the same gift as our duty, and as a Condition, which in our own persons is performed; This inferreth some moral efficiency, and so though in words they deny, yet indeed they do exalt works to some kinde of Causality: And for a *Causa sine quâ non*, though good works may be granted to be such in reference

to

to *Salvation*, yet they cannot be so in respect of *Justification*, as in the next Argument will appear: For though it be granted, That Justification and an holy purpose to do good works are inseparably joyned together, yet every thing that is inseparably concomicant to another thing is not a *Causa sine qua non*. A man cannot be but in a place, in an *ubi*, yet to be in a place, or as they call it *ubication*, is not a *Causa sine qua non*, of a man. What hath been spoken may evince, That he which performeth a Condition to which any priviledge is annexed, though inabled by grace, performeth and fulfilleth that in himself, though not of himself.

The second particular is, *That though a believer is just in himself with an inherent righteousnesse, yet as to Justification, he is righteous in another.* I shall onely mention the Texts here, because they are to be improved, when we speak of *imputed righteousnesse*: That we are righteous in Christ is clear by that full place, notwithstanding all the violent wrestings of it, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Christ was made sinne for us who knew no sinne, that we might be made the righteousnesse of God in him.* We are made *Righteousnesse*, and the *Righteousnesse of God*, but *in him*: And *Phil.* 3. 9. *Be found in him, not having my own righteousnesse.* But *Rom.* 4. its made very clear, where all along the Chapter, the Apostle cals it an *imputed righteousnesse*, not that it is *putative*, or that it is not truly *ours*, only its not *ours inherently*, but accounted of by God, as if it were our own personal righteousnesse: We are not then justified, because we fulfill Gospel-conditions in our own persons, but because we are in Christ, who is made of God *our righteousnesse*.

A fifth *Argument* is that which so much sounds in all books, *If good works be the effect and fruit of our Justification, then they cannot be Conditions, or* Causa sine qua non *of our Justification.* The Consequence is clear, because such a supposed Condition, or *Causa sine qua non*, must be antecedent, and going before. Now the Orthodox bring *Augustines* known Position, which also may be made good out of Scripture, *Bona opera non præcedunt Justificandum, sed sequuntur Justificatum*; And another to that sense is quoted out of *Gregory*, 5.

Non per opera venitur ad fidem, sed per fidem ad opera, faith must go before works; Till we are justified, we are not able to do any thing that is good. The Apostle *Tit.* 1. 15. informeth us fully what every man is till justified, *They are unclean, and all that they do is unclean.* The person must first be reconciled to God before his duties are accepted: God had first *respect unto Abel, and then to his offering. Tit.* 3. 5. *Those that have believed must be careful to maintain good works.* And *Heb.* 11. *Without faith it is impossible to please God.* Seeing therefore that *Justification is antecedent* to an holy life, good works cannot be any *Condition* of it; and by this we may see, That more things are required to our *Salvation*, then to our *Justification*; To the possession of heaven, and the entituling us thereunto; For Justification doth entitle and interest us in that eternal inheritance which is performed by faith, but to be made actual partakers of everlasting happiness, *Good works are the way to that Kingdome, not the cause of it.* Therefore none contend more then the Orthodox Writers for the necessity of good works, and that in respect of *Salvation*; yet in respect of our *Justification*, then the Scripture cals them a *menstruous rag*, and such as are *utterly unworthy*. Its true, That *Justification* cannot be continued in a man unlesse he continue in *good works*, yet for all that they are not *Conditions* of his *Justification*, they are *qualifications* and *determinations* of the *Subject* who is *justified*, but no *Conditions* of his *Justification*. As in the *generation* of man, though there be *organical dispositions* and *qualifications* for the *soul*, yet they have no *causality* upon the soul, but that is *immediately infused* by God. Its a thousand times affirmed by our Divines, Many things are required to the constitution of some Subject, which yet are not either causes or conditions of such and such an effect: Light is necessarily required, and driness, as qualities in fire, ye it burneth as its hot, not as light or dry. To the integral being of a man, are required his head and shoulders, so that the eye could not see, if not seated there, yet a mans shoulders are not the *Causa sine qua non* of his seeing. Many things are necessarily conjoyned together, and yet one is not the Condition of the others

effect.

effect. So that this Doctrine doth not exclude, but command holy works, onely it giveth faith and works their proper place.

The sixth *Argument*, *If Justification be by works as a Condition, then one man is more or lesse justified then another, and those works are required to one mans Justification which are not to another, so that there shall not be two godly men in the world justified alike.* For if faith justified as a work, then he who had a stronger faith would be more justified then he that hath a weaker: But even the weakest Christian, who by faith receiveth Christ, is justified as fully as the strongest Christian, because the righteousnesse of our Justification doth not consist in the activity of our faith, but in the fulnesse of Christ received by it; so that as Christ is not a fuller Christ to one then to another, so neither is Justification more in one then in another. The *Protestant Writers* speak no blasphemy, when they say, *Mary Magdalen* was as much justified before God, as the Virgin *Mary*; for as the same Sunne communicates its light to one as well as another, and is not exhausted, if there were more men in the world to make use of its light: So Christ is the same compleat treasure of all righteousnesse to his people, and is not exhausted by communicating himself to all: Insomuch that the weak Christian may comfort himself, saying, Though I have not so much grace, such fulnesse of holinesse as another, yet I have as full a Saviour as a stronger hath. 6.

Its true, one man may have more sense and perswasion of his Justification then another, and as was formerly shewed, Justification may be extensively in one more then another, but it cannot be essentially or intensively, which it must necessarily be if works be the Condition; for he that performeth the Condition more or lesse, receiveth the privilege promised more or lesse. 8.

The seventh *Argument*, *This Assertion according to the sense of the late Writers*, (that are otherwise Orthodox, for I mean not of *Socinians*) *will bring in a Justification two wayes, or make a two-fold Justification: whereof one will be needlesse* For they grant, *An imputation of Christs righteousnesse in re-* 7.

spect

ſpect of the Law, he fulfilled that, and ſatisfied Gods Juſtice, that the Law cannot accuſe us. And beſides this, *They make an Evangelical perſonal Juſtification, by our own Evangelical works.* Now certainly this later is wholly ſuperfluous, for if Chriſts righteouſneſſe be abundantly able to ſatisfie for all that righteouſneſſe which the Law requireth of us, What is the matter that it removeth not all our Evangelical failings, and ſupply that righteouſneſſe alſo? Surely this is to make the ſtarres ſhine when the Sunne is in its full luſtre. Thus it may be obſerved, while men for ſome ſeeming difficulty avoid the good known way of truth, they do commonly bring in Aſſertions of farre more difficulty to be received. In this caſe its farre more eaſie to maintain one ſingle righteouſneſſe, *viz.* the obedience of our Lord Chriſt, then to make two, whereof one ſhall be imputed and legal, the other Perſonal and Evangelical. Thus the *Socinians*, while they pretend the Doctrine of the Trinity impoſſible to reaſon, and as that which doth tranſcend all humane faith; Do they not aſſert a thing as improbable to reaſon, That Chriſt ſhould be a conſtituted God, and God command all ſuch adoration, faith and obedience to be given to him, as belongs to God himſelf? We hold he is naturally a God; they ſay, he is a made God. Certainly this later is more incredible. Thus men that do not believe where they ought, commonly beleeve other things more incredible, and more then they ought.

8. *Argum.* 8. *That cannot be a Condition of Juſtification, which it ſelf needeth Juſtification; But good works being imperfect, and having much droſſe cleaving, need a Juſtification to take that guilt away.* Its true, Juſtification is properly of perſons, and of actions indirectly and obliquely, yet when the perſon is juſtified, then his actions are accepted of. Now then thoſe things cannot be a Condition of acceptance, which themſelves need acceptance: How can we conceive God forgiving ſinne, and accounting us as righteous for thoſe actions, which in themſelves deſerve eternal damnation? Its true, the holy actions of a righteous man, may be truly and properly called righteous and good, but becauſe they are not exactly adequare

quate to the rule of righteousnesse, Therefore it is that in Gods severe judgement, they are damnable. This Question therefore is again and again to be propounded, if good works be the condition of our Justification, How comes the guilt in them that deserveth condemnation to be done away? Is there a further condition required to this condition, and so another to that, with a *processus in infinitum*? The Popish party and the *Castellians* are so farre convinced of this, that therefore they say, *Our good works are perfect*. And *Castellio* makes that prayer for pardon of sinne, not to belong to all the godly, but to be upon a supposition, if and when we do sinne, then we are to pray for pardon, as the command is *To agree with our adversary*, viz. if we have one; and *Honour thy Father*, viz. if we have a Father; so if we do sinne, then we must pray for the pardon of it; and for an holy life, he saith, *Christ doth as perfectly sanctifie us, as he did heal the lame and blinde* (De Justif. pag. 48). *Now* (saith he) *if a man cured of his lamenesse, should yet by his unwary walking stumble at some root in the way, should he for this be called a lame man?* And therefore in another place, *pag.* 46. he saith, *Facessat hac opinio, quæ imperfectionem vitium esse statuit*, he complaineth of the Orthodox, as holding whatsoever is not perfect is a sinne. But we acknowledge a two-fold imperfection, *negative* or *comparative*. Thus an Angel, and man created in integrity is comparatively to God imperfect; This is not a sinne, because we are not bound to have the perfection of God. But then there is a privative imperfection, when there is not that degree of grace in us which ought to be, and this is a sinne, and for the pardon of such sinnes, we are constantly to pray, and because of this pollution adhering to our best actions it is, that *Paul* judgeth them *dung and drosse* in reference to Justification, *Phil.* 3. 8. Neither can it be evaded, that *Paul* meaneth onely those actions and priviledges which formerly he enjoyed, for the Apostle speaketh not onely in the past time *hynum*, but in the 8. verse he riseth higher to the present time, καὶ ἡγοῦμαι γὰρ πάντα, *Yea doubtlesse I do count all things*; If therefore the Apostle had not included the present graces and priviledges he enjoyed, his speech

had not risen higher, which yet he evidently intended; and in this sense the Prophet *Isaiah* of old complained, *Our righteousnesses are as filthy rags*, Isa 64.6. *Isaiah* speaks this in the person of the whole Church, and not relating onely to the wicked and ungodly; therefore he useth the word *all*, and *our righteousnesses*, respecting that native corruption that cleaveth to every thing we do; not only their unrighteousnesse, but their very *righteousnesses were filthy rags*. Its true, *Calvin* forsakes this place in his Comments, as not proving the imperfections of our holy duties; but generally the learned do urge this place, and it doth strongly seem to hold out that truth. And *Daniel*, Chap. 9.18. speaks fully to this purpose, *We present not our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses, but for thy great mercies*. This likewise was visibly represented, *Exod.* 28.38. where *Aaron* the *High Priest*, a type of Christ, *was to bear the iniquity of their holy things*. Neither is that Argument, (so greatly applauded by some) of any strength at all, *viz.* That if there be imperfection cleaving to every gracious act, then at the same time the soul doth will and nill; That it produceth one act, and a contrary act thereunto at the same time: for this imperfection is herein discovered, because the principles of grace do not act so vigorously and intensly as they ought to do. Therefore being more remisse then God requireth, this defect is a sinne; so that there is not required a contrary *nolition* to what we will in that instant, but its an imperfect *volition*. Although we may adde, that the Apostle *Paul*, Rom. 7. and *Gal* 5.17. speaketh of a *combate*, and a *contrary lusting between the flesh and the Spirit*, which whether it be instantaneous or successive (though such successive acts are imperceptible) is not here to be disputed.

Others would avoid this Objection, by saying, *That Gospel-graces, which are the Conditions of the Covenant, are visible to the Law, and so Christ in satisfying the Law doth remove the imperfections cleaving to them*: And they judge it absurd to say, *That Christ hath satisfied for the sinnes of the second Covenant, or breaches thereof, which is said to be only sinful unbelief*.

But this answer may be called *Legion*, for many errors and contradictions are in it. As

1. How can justifying faith *qua talis* in the act of justifying and repentance, be reducible duties to the Law taken strictly? Indeed as it was in a large sense discovered unto the Jews, being the Covenant of Grace, as I have elsewhere proved, (*Vindic. Legis*) so it required justifying faith and repentance. But take it in the sense, as the *Abettor* of this opinion must do, justifying faith and repentance must be called the works of the Law. And then

2. If so, then the works of the Law are conditions of our Justification; and thus he runneth into the extream he would avoid.

But above all, that is not to be endured, That Christ hath not suffered for the breaches of the new Covenant, and that there is no such breach, but final impenitency; for are the defects of our repentance, faith and love in Christ, other then the partial breaches of the Covenant of Grace, our unthankfulnesse, our unfruitfulnesse, yea sometimes with *Peter* our grievous revolts and apostasies? What are these but the sad shakings of our Covenant-interest, though they do not dissolve it? But it is not my purpose to fall on this, because of its impertinency to my matter in hand.

9. *Argum. 9. If works be a Condition of our Justification, then must the godly soul be filled with perpetual doubts and troubles, whether it be a person justified or no.* This doth not follow accidentally through mans perversnesse from the fore-named Doctrine, but the very genius of it tends hereunto; for if a Condition be not performed, then the mercy covenanted cannot be claimed: As in faith, If a man doth not beleeve, he cannot say, Christ with his benefits are his: Thus if he have not works, the Condition is not performed, but still he continueth without this benefit. But for works, How shall I know, when I have the full number of them? whether is the condition of the *species* or *individuums* of works? Is not one kinde of work omitted when its my duty enough to invalidate my Justification? Will it not be as dangerous to omit that one, as all, seeing that one is required as a Condition?

on? If it be said, That by good works is meant onely a purpose and resolvednesse to do them when occasion is offered; this is to forsake the state of the Question, and the Apostle *James* who doth industriously prove, That they are works exercised and practised that do justifie.

10. The last *Argument* is, *That if good works be a Condition of justification, then none are justified till their death, because to every good work is required perseverance, insomuch that perseverance is that to which the promise is made,* Mat. 24.6. *He that endureth to the end shall be saved,* Heb. 10.38. *If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. Thus often* Revel. 2.7,26. *To him that overcometh and keepeth my works to the end, &c.* So that it is not good works simply, but persevered in, that are required, and therefore no Justification till the end of our dayes, so that we cannot have any peace with God till then. Neither doth it avail to say, Justification is not compleat till then, for it cannot be at all till then, because the condition which gives life to all is not till then. Whether perseverance and good works are distinct, are nothing to this purpose. Its certain, *Adams* and the Angels graces were distinct from perseverance; but howsoever, if perseverance be works persevering, I cannot be justified till this condition be so performed.

Thus we have asserted this truth by many Arguments, and though any one singly by it self may not convince, yet all together may satisfie. Its now time to answer that great Objection, which seemeth so directly to oppose not only what we have said, but also what the Apostle *Paul* so plainly and professedly affirmeth; For whereas *Paul* saith, *That Abraham was justified by faith without works*; and *Gal.* 2.16. *By faith, and not by works ἐξ ἔργων*, The Apostle *James*, Chap. 2. 23, 24. saith, *Abraham was justified by works*, and in the generall, *That a man is justified by works, and not by faith onely.* So that in outward appearances these two great Apostles speak contradictions, which hath made some deny the Canonical Authority of *James* his Epistle. Yea one said blasphemously *Althamerius, Mentiris (Jacobe) in capite tuum.* But this is to cut, not unty the knot. The Spirit of God which breathed in all the holy

holy Pen-men cannot dictate any contradictions.

Therefore that a reconciliation may be admitted, its necessary that the Apostle *James* take the word Justification, and the word faith in another sense then the Apostle *Paul*, and that their scopes in these expressions were upon different grounds. And hitherto the reformed Churches have generally agreed in this particular accord of these places, *Paul & James reconciled.*

1. That the scope of the Apostle *Paul* is to treat upon our Justification before God, and what is the instrument and means of obtaining it; and this he doth against those Jewish teachers, *That we were justified by the works of the Law.* But the Apostle *James* takes Justification for the declaration and manifestation of it before men, and useth the word *faith* for a *vain title* and *empty profession* of it; herein disputing against *carnal Gospellers*; who from the misunderstanding of *Pauls* Doctrine did cry down good works, and an holy life as needlesse, saying, This *titular faith* was enough; for *Paul* speaks of some in his dayes, that because he magnified grace so much, would therefore inferre, *Let us sinne that grace may abound*; *Paul* informeth us, *That faith onely justifieth*, and *James* what *kinde of faith* it is, even a *lively working faith*; and certainly that this is *James* his intent, appeareth *vers.* 14. *What doth it profit, though a man say he hath faith and no works?* Is not this to confute such a man that gloried in the name and Profession of Christ, not at all aiming at a godly life? *Abraham* did not say, he believed, and had no works in this sense. The Apostles instance likewise concerning Charity, doth evidence this, *If a man say to one in necessity, Be warmed, and be cloathed, but do nothing to relieve him, is this acceptable charity?* I forbear more Arguments, because our late Writers are copious in it.

It's said, They dare not go against the plain words of the Apostle.

But first, Its not τὸ γεγραμ, but διάνοια, not the words but the sense is to be required, otherwise the *Anthropomorphites* will be excused, and *Lapide*, who saith, *If God at the last day ask him, why he believed the bread to be turned into Christs body, he will bring that Text,* Hoc est Corpus meum, *and if he*

be deceived, that Text hath deceived him.

Again, Why should they not be afraid to go from the Apostle *Pauls* words in this matter?

Lastly, They are forced to adde to the Apostle, for they say, *Works justifie not but Conditions of the Gospel*, which the Apostle doth not speak a word of.

SERM. XXV.

That Faith as it is a work, or the credere is not Imputed unto us for our Righteousness.

ROM. 4. 23, 24.

Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him:

But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.

IN the former part of this Chapter the Apostle had strenuously asserted the manner of our Justification from an instance of *Abraham*, which having at large pursued, lest any should think that was *Abrahams* personal priviledge, and did not at all belong to us, there seeming a great diversity between *Abrahams* faith and ours, at the 23th *verse* he applieth this example to us also, shewing that *Abraham*, and all believers, all that walk in his steps are justified alike. And here we see a full overthrow of that *Socinian* Doctrine, That we and the godly in the Old Testament are not justified in the same way;

way. If this were so, the Apostles argument from *Abraham* to us would be nothing to the purpose.

In the words we have a two-fold use of Gods imputation of *Abrahams* faith to righteousnesse. The former is for his own consolation and hope. The other is for us, who, though we have not so great a faith and strong as *Abraham* had, yet having the same object, *viz.* Christ the promised seed, we may rejoyce as well as he did. Take we therefore these words as they relate to us, we may consider,

1. The *Benefit* or Priviledge spoken of, *To whom it shall be imputed*, μελλει λογιζεσθαι. The true and proper use of the word is to be handled hereafter, because the full understanding of that is of great concernment; onely for the present observe, the Apostle useth a future verb, to signifie the continuation of this mercy in the Church. That as God did so still he will justifie those that shall believe, in the way he justified *Abraham*. The *Benefit* is, that their faith shall be imputed for righteousnesse: In what sense this is to be understood we shall hear anon.

2. There is the *Subject* to whom this great priviledge shall be made good, and that is to those that do believe: without this hand that heavenly treasure cannot be received. Its not those that work, but that believe.

3. Here is the *Description* of this justifying faith from the *true and specifical Object of it*; for though justifying faith doth believe the whole word of God, the Histories and the Threatnings, yet it doth not justifie, but as it relates to God in Christ. This justifying faith therefore is described from the fiducial nature of it. *He that believeth*, ὁ πιστευων, as it is not unusual among Heathenish Authors; so in the Scripture it denotes the recubency and fiducial repose that the soul hath in the object believed, though sometimes it be applied to such as do not fiducially believe, *John* 2. 24. its described from the object which is God raising up Christ. *Who was delivered for our offences, and rose for our Justification.* This expression, διὰ βραχέων, *breviter* and *longe*, short, because in few words, but long, because its the summe of the Gospel. We shall when we what is the object of

faith

faith in its Justification, *viz.* Christ crucified, and raised by the Father for the expiation of our sins, and Justification of our persons; faith doth not justifie as it is a work, or from any intrinsecal dignity in it, but from the object, which is the Lord Christ, it layeth hold upon.

Whereas then we have formerly shewed, That our Justification is not by works that we do under any notion whatsoever, we now proceed to confute those, who make *faith as it is a work*, or the τὸ *credere* to be imputed unto us for our righteousnesse.

Observ. *That faith, not as it is a work, or for any dignity in it self, but from the object Christ Jesus, doth only justifie us.*

This is necessary to be handled with much diligence, because some, though they exclude works, yet make faith to justifie as it is a work, and to be in stead of all that legal righteousnesse, which God required in the Covenant of works, That faith should be in the Covenant of Grace, what works would have been in the Covenant of works.

Before we come to the argumentative part, take notice of some particulars:

1. First, *That when faith is all along this Chapter, said to be imputed for righteousnesse, thereby is meant* Justitia personæ *not* facti, *an universal righteousnesse of the person, not of the fact.* Some are very pertinacious in the exposition of it this later way, and parallel it with that place, *Psal.* 106. 31. where *Phinees executed Justice, and it was accounted to him for righteousnesse*, where all agree, that was a righteousnesse of the fact; but being it might be doubted, whether he had any call to it or no, God did approve it, and looked on it as a just and righteous act. The like expressions we have *Deut.* 6. 25. and *Deut.* 24. 13. in which places an universal righteousnesse of the person, so as to be justified before God is not understood. Now that in this Chapter we must necessarily interpret the phrase thus, appeareth in that the Apostles scope all along the Chapter is, to shew what is that whereby we are justified before God, how we do become blessed, and have our iniquities forgiven us, and if it were not so, we could not be justified as *Abraham* was, for *Abraham* believing, it

it was a work cannot be put in practice by us, though our faith may be exercised upon the like objects his was. Neither can it be doubted, whether *Abraham* did well or no in believing, that therefore it should be accounted a righteous act, and free from any accusation of it. The righteousnesse then *Paul* speaks of is so universal, that thereby the person is justified in all points before God.

Secondly, *That this phrase (Faith imputed to righteousnesse) may have several interpretations, for which there are many parties do strive.* And

1. The *Pontificians*, they consider *faith materially*, as it is a bare and naked assent, not formed as yet by charity, and so (they say) faith doth justifie *dispositive*; They make such a naked assent to be a disposition to our Justification. Now although this Historical or Dogmatical assent be necessarily required to Justification, yet this is no disposition to it, seeing even devils and hypocrites have it. Again, They consider faith as it is enformed by charity, and so they make it part of our inherent righteousnesse, and that by it we are formally justified, yea causally and meritoriously, as we are by any other good work. But this proceedeth upon a false supposition, that Justification doth formally consist in that righteousnesse which is subjectively seated in us, as also from the perverting of the Apostles constant argumentation, from the position of faith to the exclusion of works.

2. There are others who expound it thus, We are justified by faith, that is, faith as it is a work, is accepted of by God for our Justification, and these are divided into two sorts, first of *Socinus*, *Servetus* and others, who make the act of faith to constitute us just before God, (*Lubber. contra Bertium*, p. 27.) Not that this is done for the merits of Christ, or any satisfaction made to the Father; but these two things they affirm, first, That faith as a work justifieth. Secondly, That it is the meer grace and condescension of God to reckon this faith for our perfect righteousnesse. This they call *Dei gratiosam acceptilationem*, accounting that which is lame and imperfect for perfect obedience, for they make faith to be informed by obedience, obedience to be *forma fidei*, of which afterwards.

2. But there are a second sort, and these do pertinaciously assert the τὸ *credere* to be our righteousnesse, and that the phrase, *Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for righteousnesse*, is to be understood properly without any Trope at all. The ring-leader of this was *Arminius* (for I regard not *Abailardus*) who expresly saith, τὸ *credere imputari in justitiam, id; proprio sensu non Metonymicè*, (*Epist. ad Hippol.*) and in other places, Faith is the object of divine imputation; faith as it is an act performed according to the command of the Gospel, is imputed before God for righteousnesse, and that of meer grace, seeing it is not the righteousnesse of the Law, and thus *Bertius*, *Vorstius*, with many others, as may be seen in *Festus Hommius* (*Spec. Controv. p.* 82.) denying it to be considered as an instrument, but as a condition or duty in Justification. And to this purpose a late English Writer hath manifested himself, *As God in the first Covenant of works required an absolute and perfect obedience to the whole Law for every mans Justification; So* (saith he) *in the Covenant of Grace he requireth nothing of man, but onely faith in his Sonne, which faith shall be as available unto him for his full Justification, as a perfect righteousnesse should have been under the first Covenant.* Thus you see what is the sense of these Authours, That faith as it is a duty required in the Covenant of Grace, is accepted of by God for all that whole righteousnesse which we were bound to have; onely it may be wondered, why they should thus attribute it unto faith; seeing *Vorstius*, *Bertius*, and others, say, Works are not excluded from Justification, *viz.* such works as flow from the sincere root of faith, and that the Apostle excludeth onely works of the Law done by our own strength, and such as wherein a constant and perpetual observation of the Law doth consist; and therefore they say, that rule of *Augustine*, *Good works do not precede but follow the person justified*, is *hunc unitis studiis*, and never to be admitted, as being not a Scripture truth, unlesse by Justification be meant conversion from sinnes to righteousnesse. Therefore to reconcile this, they must certainly with the *Socinians* confound faith and repentance.

Lastly,

Lastly, There is a party that expounds this phrase [*Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for righteousnesse*] not in a proper sense, but a figurative, either a Metonymy, or a Metalepsis. By faith is understood that thing, which faith apprehended and laid hold upon. Thus it is often said, Faith justifieth *organice*, and *relative*, in respect of the object it receiveth, That as the hand receiveth the treasure which makes a man rich; so doth faith receive that Christ, who is made of God our righteousnesse. So that faith doth not justifie from any dignity or worth it hath, no nor for the work of apprehension or application of Christ, but meerly because of Christ. This is that Interpretation which we conceive to be the most orthodox, grounded upon Scripture, and consented unto generally by the Reformed Churches. Onely I adde, should it be granted, that faith is understood properly, yet it will not thereby necessarily advantage the Author we oppose, as is more to be shewed. 'Tis true, with *Arminius*, *Episcopius*, and others, its matter of offence to say, Faith justifieth as an instrument, but onely as a condition prescribed by the Evangelical Covenant; and I heartily wish others had not swallowed this Camel. 3.

Thirdly, *When we speak of faith justifying or imputed to righteousnesse*, you may take notice of these two things:

1. That faith hath *its adequate and general object*.

2. *Its principal and specificall*. The adequate and general object of faith is the whole word of God, consisting of Histories, Threatning, Commands, as well as Promises. True faith doth give firm assent to all Gods word, because Divine Authority and Revelation is the form of it. But then the principal and secondary object is the Promises, as the *Objectum quo*, but Christ in them as the *Objectum quod*; and faith justifieth not as it believeth the whole word of God, but as it rests on Christ. In the Text it is, *On him that raised Christ from the dead, who was delivered for our sinnes*: But because this is controverted, more may be said of it hereafter.

2. As faith hath a two-fold object, so it hath a two-fold effect. There are the effects of faith *ad intra*, and the effects of it *ad extra*. The effects of faith within, are as it respects Christ, and layeth hold on him, in which sense it is often said, *to receive*, as you formerly heard, and in this respect onely it justifieth; and secondly, There are the effects of it *ad extra*, as faith puts us upon the exercise of all holy duties, in which sense the Apostle speaks of it in *Heb.* 11. It was their faith made them have an holy fear, and inabled them to self-denying passages of obedience, but we are not thus to look upon it as working, when we speak of our Justification.

Therefore in the fourth place, *Take heed of confounding faith with obedience, as too many do; our Justification consists in receiving from God, not giving to him; and faith stretcheth out the hand to take, not to give.* There is a great deal of difference in these two expressions, or the sense of them, when you say of a poor lame beggar, his hands help, his hands relieve him, and when you speak of a labouring man, who works all the day long for his wages, for the hands of the later relieve him as they work, of the former as they receive: Thus our faith makes us partakers of this excellent priviledge, because it receiveth Christ into the heart; whereas if we look upon faith, as obedience, we are taken off from Christ, and look to our selves; and although it may be granted, That faith is in some sense obedience, yet in the act of Justification its not considered as obediential. But to speak the truth, the places instanced in for to prove the obedience of faith, are not to the purpose, *Rom.* 1. 5. *Rom.* 16. 26. for faith is not there taken for a grace in the soul, the *quâ creditur*, as its called, but for the Doctrine of Faith, the *Fides qua creditur*, the Doctrine which is believed; so that obedience of faith is that obedience which Faith or the Doctrine of God requireth. Thus 2 *Corinth.* 10. 5. there is εἰς ὑπακοὴν Χριστοῦ, the obedience of Christ, that is, unto Christ, and not Christs obedience subjectively: So 1 *Pet.* 1. 22. The obedience of the truth is that obedience which

which the truth commands. Therefore, though many, some more openly, some more covertly would have you to consider faith as in an obedience, yet in the matter of Justification, look upon the passiveneſſe of it onely.

Theſe things premiſed, Let us prove this truth, *That Faith juſtifieth not as it is a work, but only from Chriſt received by it, that faith is not in a proper ſenſe imputed to us for our righteouſneſſe.* And

1. First, *This Argument ſeemeth to be very pregnant, becauſe the Apoſtle all along this Chapter oppoſeth faith and works, the believer and the worker.* Now his Argument would be of no force, if faith could be conſidered as a work, yea how abſurdly would they make the Apoſtle to ſpeak, *To him that worketh not, but believeth*, that is, To him that worketh not, but worketh: And again, *Bleſſed is the man to whom God imputeth righteouſneſſe without works*, that is, a work without works. *Abraham believed*, (that is) he worked; and thus from hence all along prove, he was not juſtified by works. Certainly, this is to make the Apoſtle argue very imperfectly, to make two oppoſite members in a diſtinction, and then to argue from one to the excluſion of the other, when yet that is included, can never be made good Logick. None then can rationally perſwade himſelf, That when *Paul* argued againſt works by faith, that he thought on faith as a work: So that we are not in matter of Juſtification to relie on our faith, as if for that we were juſtified.

2. Secondly, *Faith cannot be imputed unto us for our total and perfect righteouſneſſe, becauſe its not a perfect righteouſneſſe, nor all the righteouſneſſe God requireth.* That faith which God commands is but part of our duty, not all our duty, and then what it is, is but imperfect; for we cannot beleeve perfectly, no more then we can love God, or do other gracious exerciſes perfectly, *We know but in part*, and ſo can beleeve but in part. The *Diſciples* are often reproved for their *little Faith*, ſo that they ſpeak

farre more consonantly to reason, though they proceed upon a false supposition, who make our faith and works perfect, at least so farre as the Word requireth. But now to say, That faith is accounted of by God for our compleat righteousnesse, when acknowledged to be imperfect, and not all the righteousnesse we ought to do, is to speak a manifest absurdity, for this is to make God to judge otherwise of a thing then it is, and that he doth not account of things as they are. For he shall receive this, as a full debt, which indeed is not a full debt; and like that Steward in the Parable, who though he is commended for wisdome, yet not for honesty, that for an hundred pound debt, bid the debtor write down fifty. Its therefore both against the wisdome and righteousnesse of God, to say, He receiveth that for a perfect righteousnesse, which is not, or imputeth that to be righteousnesse, which is not so. Neither may we conceive in God any such gracious condescension as to receive an imperfect righteousnesse for a perfect; for why not as well no righteousnesse at all for perfect? And why not a merciful pardon also coming from God without any satisfaction, as the *Socinians* blaspheme. But the Opinionists with whom we have to deal disclaim such things.

3. But lest this evasion should entice any away, therefore the third Argument is thus placed, *If faith which is imperfect should because of Christs merits be graciously esteemed for an universal righteousnesse, then Christ did not properly die for persons, but for graces, he did not die that the beleever might be saved immediately and properly, but that his faith might be accounted a formal compleat righteousnesse.* Now if we observe the Scripture, that speaks universally in this sense, *That Christ died for sinners*, who beleeving in him have thereby eternal life; and *Rom.* 3. *Through faith in his blood we have remission of sinnes*; whereas, according to the contrary opinion, the immediate and proper end of Christs death should be to merit at Gods hand, That an imperfect faith should be accounted for a full righteousnesse, and thus Christ would die

not

not for persons, but for conditions. But is not this to go against the universal stream of the Scripture? Doth that any where make this the end of Christs death, that thereby God should esteem that perfect, which otherwise is not, and not rather wholly for such who being sinners in themselves, yet repenting of, and renouncing all that is theirs, do acquiesce wholly in him as a Mediator.

The fourth *Argument* is, *If faith should justifie as it is a work, then he that believeth more strongly then another, should be more justified then another, and thus our Justification should* recipere magis *and* minus. Its true (you heard) the sense and application of our Justification may admit of degrees, but Justification it self cannot, no more then Christ can be more or lesse: One eye may see the Sunne better then another, but the Sunnes light is equal to all. Hence the Apostle argueth from *Abrahams believing*, *accounted to righteousnesse*, *to every Christian believing*, *though never so weak and languishing*, which could never be if faith did justifie as a work, for who could so easily reply, *Abrahams* example is nothing to us, we have not such faith as *Abraham* had? You see how the Apostle aggravateth that, as it was a work, *Rom.* 4. *That the staggered not through unbelief, but against hope beleeved in hope*; Seeing therefore that *Abraham* produced such an high act of faith, that if you respect the object beleeved, or the manner of effecting it, all was very supernatural; This instance could not be brought to all justified persons, whose faith is very weak, and never able to put forth such strength and vigour, unlesse its Justification was from the object, which is common to the weak Christians faith, as well as the strong. So that by this we see, if *Abrahams* faith justified, as it was *a work*, it could not be brought as an universal Rule for all beleevers, because many attain not to such an high degree of faith, or else it would plunge many godly persons in despair, as if they could never be justified, because they cannot beleeve with such strength and fortitude as *Abraham* did; yea, Is it not the sad temptation which many of Gods children have, 4.

have, *That their faith is very weak, they find little stirrings of it*; Now what an *Abyss* would the godly Minister cast this soul into, if he should say, Though your faith be true and sincere, yet it is not active and strong enough, you must beleeve equally to *Abraham*, if you would be justified: were not this to give as they did to Christ, gall in stead of wine to drink?

5. Fifthly, *If faith justifieth as it is a work, or be accounted for righteousnesse, then a thing must be an instrument to it self, which is wholly absurd to conceive; for nothing can be* instrumentum & instrumentatum, *it cannot be the instrument, and the thing received by the instrument, as a mans hand cannot be the treasure it receiveth.* The Artificers tools are not the house he makes; the hysops sprinkling of bloud in the Jewish Sacrifice, was not the bloud of the consecration it self: So faith is not our righteousnesse, but the means to obtain it. Hence *Gal.* 3. and *Phil.* 3. its called *the righteousnesse by faith*, which could not be if faith were the righteousnesse, as righteousnesse by the Law did not imply the Law was accounted for righteousnesse, but the means by which it cometh. So then faith is no more our righteousnesse, then the mouth is our meat and drink. We have it by faith, it is not faith it self, nothing can be an instrument to obtain it self.

SERM. XXVI.

More Arguments to prove, That Faith as it is a Work, is not Imputed unto us for our Righteousnesse; With Answers to Objections. Also handling the Point of the Instrumentality of Faith.

ROM. 4. 23, 24.

Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him, &c.

WE have hitherto asserted this Position, *That Faith as it is a Work, is not imputed unto us for our righteousnesse:* I shall be the briefer in it, because what Arguments overthrow works in the general, as to the matter of Justification, the same will stand good for faith in particular only, I shall adde to the fore-mentioned.

Therefore in the fifth place, *If Faith doth justifie as a work, then am I justified by something that is mine, it will be my righteousnesse, which yet Paul renounceth,* Phil. 3. 9. Although the godly mans faith be the gift of God, yet it is the believers work, *'tis* man that believeth, and not God, and so the *Just is said to live by his faith.* Faith therefore though originally coming from God, yet subjectively being a mans own righ-

righteousnesse, must necessarily follow, That still the righteousnesse a man is justified by, is his own, and within him. Now its good to observe, That the Scripture never saith, Faith justifieth in an *active sense*, but always we are justified by faith in a *passive sense*; and what may be the reason of this, but that hereby the Scripture would exclude faith as a work? for if it did justifie as a work, then it might have properly been said, that faith justifieth: We must not then onely go out of our works, but our faith also. As the hand which *Moses* stretched out in working of miracles, was struck with the leprosie, to shew, that it was no efficacy in his hand, whereby those wonderfull things were wrought; So that faith which justifieth, hath even a leprosie, an uncleannesse cleaving to it, and therefore as a work cannot justifie, because that it self needeth Justification.

66 Sixthly, *If Faith justifie as a work, then it is no matter what the object is, so that it be a divine truth.* Thus every dogmatical faith must be justifying. The Consequence is evident; for if the power to justifie arise not from the object of faith, but from faith as an act exercised, then whersoever this is put forth, there Justification followeth; whereas we see the Apostle limits this justifying faith *to Christ crucified*, and *Rom. 3.25. Its through faith in his blood.* Now, how absurd would it be to say, That I am justified as well by believing that *Judas* hanged himself, as that Christ was crucified for my offences? Though the adversary washh himself with sope and nitre, yet he cannot get off this spot. Though he would seem to make Christ crucified the object of justifying faith, yea in some sense make faith an instrument to lay hold upon Christ, yet herein they speak plain contradictions to themselves, or else use such words, as *Augustine* saith the *Pelagians* of old would the word Grace, and *fraguendam invidiam*. Certainly, if the work of faith justifieth, then wheresoever this work puts it self forth, let the object be what it will be, there must Justification follow; for the work of faith lieth in captivating the understanding and heart, to what truth God hath revealed, because of his Authority. And this Obedience or submission is in one truth as well

as in another, in respect of the motive to believe it.

Seventhly, *This Doctrine must needs obscure and diminish the worth and merits of Christ, yea Christ is hereby made only a remote cause of our righteousnesse, not the proper and immediate one.* For by this opinion, Christ by his death shall purchase at Gods hand, that our faith shall be accounted for a perfect righteousnesse; so that faith is our immediate, formal and proper righteousnesse, Christ is onely the remote cause. Thus the Papists say about the righteousnesse of works, that *tincta sanguine Christi*, died in the bloud of Christ, they justifie us. Works are made the immediate cause of our righteousnesse, Christ the remote one; what they speak of works, to the same sense these speak of faith: But the Scripture saith, *We are made the righteousnesse of God in him*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. and its a righteousnesse imputed unto us without works: We are immediately and proximely to appear in Christ, not in our selves. 7.

Eighthly, *This Position overthroweth the imputation of Christs righteousnesse unto us, it makes it wholly superfluous and needlesse; for if faith be the proper righteousnesse accepted of by God, then Christs righteousnesse done for me is needlesse*; what need two Sunnes in one orb? If nature, certainly grace doth not multiply *entities* without necessity, and truly the righteousnesse of Christ would not in the Scripture have been so commended, had faith been that which justifieth; the crown must be taken from Christ, and put upon the head of faith; for although faith justifieth because of Christ, and he hath purchased it, yet the proxime and immediate cause hath the chiefest glory. That Christs righteousnesse is imputed to us, and so we in and by that immediately and proximely, stand justified before God, is in its due time to be effectually proved. 8.

Let us in the next place consider, what Objections are brought, either by *Papists*, *Arminians*, or others in this matter; for though upon different grounds, yet they all agree in this, *That Faith doth not justifie as it meanes apprehending or laying hold on Christ*, that is but *Nuga* with the *Remonstrants*. And

Object. 1. First, They urge very speciously, *That the Apostle in this fourth Chapter, doth several times say, Faith is imputed for righteousnesse, not mentioning Christs righteousnesse at all.* Now say they, *This is the proper place and seat of this Doctrine, therefore the Apostle would not use tropical expressions, which would rather obscure then clear the matter.* Again, They remind us of *Augustines* Rule, *We must never go from the proper literal sense, unlesse when manifest necessity doth compell, otherwise we shall turn the Scripture into an Allegory, and make no sure foundation of any point in Christianity; yea* (they say) *we cannot bring the like instance of any such phrase.*

Answ. In these things they are very confident, but for the first its granted, that this is the proper and most eminent place where Justification is handled, not in all the necessary points of it, onely what is the way, and manner how we are justified, and therefore the Apostle could not speak otherwise then he doth; for seeing the Question between the Jews and *Paul* was, Whether we are justified by *believing* or *working?* Its necessary *Paul* should conclude by believing. But then for the *matter* or *form* of our Justification, that is not directly touched upon in this place. Its not necessary that the Apostle should speak all things requisite to the knowledge of Justification in one place. *Paul* therefore determineth according to the Question stated, That it is not by working, but by believing that we are justified. But whether this believing be terminated on Christs righteousnesse, was not in this place to be decided.

2. Secondly, It is necessary that faith should be thus understood *Metonymically* or *correlatively* from other places of Scripture, as *Rom.*5. when its said, *By Christs obedience we are made righteous*, when Christ is called, *The Lord our righteousnes*, when 1 *Cor.*1.30. Christ is said *to be made of God our righteousnes*, and we said *to be the righteousnes of God in him*, 1 Cor. 5. 21. These places do evince, that faith cannot be our proper righteousnes; for all will acknowledge we do not need two righteousnesses: then if Christ be our righteousnes, faith cannot be, and if faith, then Christ cannot be. If it be said, Christ is

said

said to be our righteousnes *Metonymically*, or the cause is put for the effect; We urge their own Rule, they must not depart from the plain letter without necessity. Besides, here they acknowledge such a figurative expression used often in the Scripture, which yet they demanded an instance in before: So that the matter being brought to this, either when its said, *Christ is made our righteousnesse*, this must be understood properly; or when faith is said to be imputed for righteousnesse, this must be understood improperly, or *è contra*; We say there is great reason of understanding the phrase concerning faith improperly.

For the Arguments above-mentioned, to which we may add further these considerations,

1. That the Scripture saith expressely, *Christ is our righteousnesse*, and *That we are made the righteousnesse of God in him*, but it doth not say any where, *That faith is imputed to righteousnesse*; it saith indeed, *Faith is accounted for righteousnesse to him that believeth*, verf. 3, 5, 9, 11, 24. But there is a great difference between these two Propositions, *Faith is accounted for righteousnesse*, and *Faith is accounted to him that believeth for righteousnesse*, for the one speaks of faith in its own nature, and if used by the Apostle, would greatly have favoured the adversaries cause, as if faith it self had been accounted by God for a perfect righteousnesse in its own consideration: But now when its said, *To be accounted to the believer for righteousnesse*, that may imply no more, then that by his faith he doth obtain a righteousnesse; as we may say, Such a mans confidence of possessing such wealth to be given him, makes him rich, by that not intending the confidence it self, but his riches the object thereof make him rich.

2. We cannot take faith properly for righteousnesse, because in the same Chapter, and in this discourse the Apostle distinguisheth it; Therefore the phrase must be improper, for *verf.* 11. its called, *The righteousnesse of faith*, and not *Righteousnesse faith*: So *verf.* 13. the promise is said *to be through the righteousnesse of faith*; for as when it is said, *The righteousnesse of the Law*, the meaning is not, that the Law is

righteousnesse, but the means to it: So when its said, *The righteousnesse of faith*, the sense is not, that faith is the righteousnesse, but a means to it: So that the same Apostle, when he saith, Faith is accounted for righteousnesse to a believer, yet also calling it a righteousnesse by faith, doth plainly discover that he intends not, that faith is properly accounted for our righteousnesse, as if that were all we were now bound to do in the Covenant of Grace, but onely that by this faith we are made partakers of Gospel-righteousnesse.

3. Faith must be understood as it relateth to Christ, not in it self, because that promise, in the beleeving whereof *Abraham* is said *to be justified*, doth directly look upon Christ: for the *seed promised*, which was the object of *Abrahams* faith, is directly and expressely interpreted by the Apostle, *Gal.* 3. 16. to be *Christ*; and in this sense Christ said, *Abraham saw his day, and rejoyced*; if therefore the object of *Abrahams* faith was not a bare promise of a temporal seed, but of such *a seed in whom all Nations*, yea *Abraham* himself *was to be blessed*, then it was not faith apprehending, but Christ apprehended that is our righteousnesse.

Lastly, It must needs be a *figurative expression*, because the faith that is mentioned is but one act, though indeed a very famous and remarkable one. Now how improbable is it to say, that one act meerly of faith, should stand for all the obedience God requireth, and be as much as if a man had personally fulfilled the whole Law? To make one act of faith, thus the whole Gospel-righteousnesse seemeth to be very irrational. Certainly, though they do much mistake that joyn faith and works together in our Justification, yet to hold faith as a work justifieth, and to exclude all other works of grace, which yet are required, seemeth to be farre more absurd and inconsequential.

And thus much to the first and second part of their Objection, we must not recede from the *literal sense*, especially when it is the professed handling of a truth. Although we might further adde, That thus *Bellarmine* argueth for the literal explication of *Hoc est Corpus meum*, because here Christ

Christ intended to give the true knowledge of the Sacrament, and that upon his death, therefore not likely he would darken his speech with figurative expressions.

As for the third part of their Objection, That we cannot shew such like phrases, where faith must be understood thus for the object. To this we answer, That faith is not excluded in the interpretation, but it doth comprehend the object also. We grant that by faith is meant *that gracious act of the soul, only when is attributed to it, ariseth not from its work, but from the object.* When we speak of Justification its necessary to name that motion of the soul, or means whereby we obtain it, and thus *Paul* doth: So that faith is not excluded or shut out, but its to be understood as receiving of Christ, whose righteousnesse doth justifie us. Although we may adde many such like expressions, as that, *Thy faith hath made thee whole*; by faith is not meant faith as an act or work, but the power and strength of Christ apprehended by faith, miraculous faith was not so called, as if thereby the person was endowed with an almighty power to work miracles, but because it rested on Christs power: Even as the womans touching of Christs garment did not heal her, but the vertue that came from him. Thus also we are said to be *saved by hope*, that is, by the thing hoped for. Its very ordinary in Scripture to attribute that to the habit, or act of the soul, which belongs to the object, which is the *Adjunctum* of the *adjunct* for the *subject*. Nothing is more ordinary, so that I need not insist therein.

Though these things seem clear, yet it is acknowledged that some Orthodox Interpreters understand faith properly; hence *Gomarus* in his analytical explication of this place, brings Arguments why we must understand it without any figure, and addeth, if there were a Trope to be admitted, it would be more conveniently in the predicate then in the subject, in righteousnesse then in faith, in this sense, Faith is imputed to righteousnesse, that is, the instrumental cause of righteousnesse. But I rather encline to the more common Interpretation I mentioned.

The

Object. 2. The second *Argument*, That faith justifieth as a work, as a cause or part of our formal righteousnesse, is from the Papists quiver; for *Bellarmine* saith, *The expressions of justified by faith, denote some causality, and that we give nothing at all to faith, while we make it only an instrument to receive Christs righteousnesse; For (saith he) who would say to a poor man that hath only stretched out his hands to receive an alms, that his hands made him have the alms? or to a sick man, taking the physick in his hand, who would say, thy hand hath healed thee? Therefore its too little and low, when we expound a man is justified by faith thus, that is, its an hand to receive it, and for this he presseth hard, the Prepositions διὰ, ἐκ &c. by and through, which as when applied to God and Christ, signifie causality, so it must also when applied to faith.* This seemeth to be a specious Objection.

Answ. But the answer is, That those Prepositions are used divers wayes in the Scripture, and so do signifie such a causality, as the subject matter requireth: when applied to God and Christ, they signifie an efficient and meritorious cause, but in other places they signifie onely an instrument or means by which, so *Matth.* 7. 13. *Enter through the strait gate:* Its said of the Wise men, *Matthæi* 2. διʼ ἄλλης ὁδοῦ, *They went by another way*, Act. 14. 22. *Through many afflictions*: we might shew very many places, where the Preposition διὰ doth not signifie any cause, but a *means through which*, so that there cannot be any strength laid upon the Preposition.

Whether faith may be called an instrumental cause of justification, and in what sense. A learned *Lubertus Agonisma Theol. de Justif.* 106.

Onely it may be doubted, Whether faith may be called an instrumental cause of our Justification: For though some do roundly call it so, yet others call it an *organon sine quo non*. One saith, When Divines speak accurately and exactly, they call it not an instrument but a *medium*. *Penelius* alledged by *Fraxinus*, *Spec. Not. in Armin. cap.* 17. *de Justif. Not.* 7. speaketh thus, *Fides correcta ad Justitiam Christi à Deo oblatam & collatam considerata, non tam operis aut actionis operatoriæ rationem habet, quam passionis & subjecti recipientis, ideoque homines Justitiam recipientes à Deo agi potius, quam agere sunt dicendi.* But this Author must understand *subjectum quo*, not *quod*; for faith is not the ultimate subject, but *man* of Justification. And

And certainly when generally its said to be the instrument of our Justification, by that is meant no more *then a means appointed by God, in the use whereof we are made partakers of Christs righteousnesse.* In this sense *Perkins* cals faith *Instrumentum supernaturale creatum à Deo in animo hominis*, whereby he layeth hold on, and applieth Christs righteousnesse to himself. This is certain, That whatsoever expressions the Orthodox use about faith in our Justification, they all agree, that this is not from any dignity of faith, or that hereby any thing is attributed to man: yea hereby they say, Man is wholly debased, and wholly outed of himself, Christ being exalted all in all.

Now because this Assertion of faith justifying instrumentally hath several censures, and that by men of contrary judgment; *Bellarmine* thinking that thereby we give nothing at all to faith; and others, that we give too much, because every instrumental cause is reduced to an efficient; Therefore its good to dig to the root of this matter, and although we have already said enough about faiths passive instrumentality in Justification, yet for further explication sake, let us adde some further consideration about *Instruments*, and they may be divided into *Artificial*, *Natural* and *Divine*. Of Instruments.

For *Artificial Instruments*, if we thorowly consider it, we shall finde little more then a passive habitude, or respect in them unto that ultimate effect of art, which is intended by the Artificer, and some are more passive then others: some instruments of art, have indeed a causality by a previous disposing and working upon the subject, as when the Saw drawn between the wood doth expell part of it, either formally, as *Scotus*, or rather efficiently, as *Suarez*, removing it to another place. In this and the like instances *Artificial Instruments* have an efficient causality, but they are not called *Instruments* (as *Suarez* well observeth) in respect of this previous disposition, but of the ultimate effect of Art, as the Saw and hammer are called instruments, not in respect of the cutting or beating, but of the house or the statue and image, which the Artificer by them accomplisheth: So that if we speak of the Artificial effect intended by the Artificer, they Artificial.

are instruments onely by a passive relation, and therefore whether the Artificer make an image of a beast, or man, its all one to the instrumental tools, they incline not, or determine to one way more then another, which argueth they have no efficiency, as to the effect of art, in which respect they are properly called instruments. But that there are artificial passive instruments appeareth plainly in musical instruments, which are called instruments κατ' ἐξοχὴν, for in most of them its plain there is nothing but a local motion of the strings, and an artificial impression upon them by the hand, and them in respect of the melodious sound, they are thereby made passive instruments: So that I think we may almost generally say, That artificial instruments in respect of the effect of art ultimately intended, are passive instruments, and are so called, not in respect of a causal attingency immediately of that artificial effect, but from a passive relation thereunto.

Natural. In the second place, There are instrumental causes in *Nature*, as when the seed of a flower falling to the ground doth instrumentally produce another flower: It cannot be denied but that such have an intrinsecal power to produce such a determinate effect, and such causes as these are to be reduced to the efficient, because they work by an inward connatural ability, but I suppose when Divines call faith an instrumental cause of Justification, they do not mean such a cause.

Therefore lastly, There are divine instruments, when God by his appointment and will causeth such a thing to be in the use or application of such or such means. Now these may be said to be instruments of such a mercy, not that they have any efficient causality either principal or instrumental, onely the effect is produced not by any vertue of such means used, but because of Gods appointment: and thus faith when it justifieth as an instrument, doth it as a divine, supernatural instrument, not as a natural, which will further appear in handling this Question, Whose instrument it is, whether Gods or mans? I need not say much to this: See Mr *Blake* in that solid and learned Tractate of his (*Vindic. Fœderis*, p. 81, 82.) Its there answered, That it's both the instrument of

God and man, though in a different sense; and to this purpose Doctor *Ames* (*Bellar. Enerv. Tom. quart. pag.* 18.) *Fides quamvis possit vocari instrumentum Dei, quia Deus justificat nos ex fide & per fidem, proprie tamen est instrumentum nostrum*; Its Gods instrument in a large sense, as being that which through his power is created in us, and by which he justifieth us; yet *quoad actum exercitum*, its properly our instrument, because its we, and not God that believeth. Its Gods instrument in respect of his institution and ordination of it for such an end. Its mans instrument, as that which is exercised and applied by him: yet though man believeth, he doth not justifie himself, partly because it doth not justifie as a work, but from Christ believed upon; and partly, because Justification doth not follow as a necessary, natural effect of believing, but from the gracious appointment of God, as is to be shewed in answering the next Question. Only by the way you may observe, That Justification is not attributed to faith in the same sense that it is denied to works, for those that pleaded for justification by works, did not look upon works in such an organical and relative sense, but as causes of Justification, and the Apostle excluding them, doth assert faith not absolutely and in the same causality, but respectively to the bloud of Christ.

The last Question may be, *If faith justifieth, How doth it come to justifie? Is Justification a necessary and natural effect of believing, or comes it meerly by the divine appointment or institution of God, as looking upon the brazen Serpent procured healing, not by any inward implanted force, but by the command of God?*

Now to this we answer two things:

1. That faith doth not necessarily and properly produce Justification, as the fire doth burning; So that whosoever doth believe would be justified, though God had appointed no such way, though he had not made such a promise. Therefore its a calumny cast upon the Orthodox, as if they delivered any such thing, and against reason, for no habit can have two immediate proper distinct acts: If therefore to believe be the natural act of that habit, to be justified cannot

be. Besides, Justification though it be received by us, yet is a gracious priviledge vouchsafed by God as he pleaseth, and so cannot be the natural effect of any thing within us.

Yet in the second place, Though it be Gods promise and grace to annex Justification to our believing, Our Divines do well say, That faith hath naturally a passive aptitude and fitnesse in it to receive Christ, which other graces have not. So that although this natural fitnesse be not a cause, yet the goodnesse of God makes use of it for such an end. Therefore though one speak confidently, That when causes have a natural power to produce such effects, its improper, if not ridiculous to ascribe such effects to the will and pleasure of God; yet herein is much errour and mistake; for we say not, Faith hath a natural power to justifie, as the fire to burn (though even such natural causes in their operations are reduced to Gods will) (for when he did not will, the raging fire could not burn those three worthies) but only it hath a passive aptitude from its nature to be ordained by God for such an end, which other graces have not; as the hand hath a natural fitnesse to receive, which the head, though a more noble part cannot do. As in the matter of the Lords Supper, we say, the form of a Sacrament lieth in the words of Institution, yet it pleased God to take such elements that have a natural fitnesse to represent the body and bloud of Christ; But the bread and wine could not do this sacramentally without an institution: so its here, though faith have such a natural fitnesse, as to receive and lay hold on Christ, yet that in and by this Justification shall be vouchsafed, is from the appointment of God.

Thus have we demolished those false wayes asserted by many for Justification by faith, and declared the truth with the establishment of it. I shall speak a word to the opinion of a late writer, (*Justification Justified*) who rejects all the former senses of Justification by faith, either as a work, or an instrument, and pitcheth upon a notion of his own: having in that whole Sermon asserted many Novelisms, *Faith*, he saith, *justifieth, because it is the first grace that doth act upon Christ, and rest upon him for Justification*: But where is one

word

word of Scripture attributing Justification to faith, because of this priority? The word of God relates always to the object of faith, not to any such presupposed order. Besides, by this rule a man is not justified after his conversion by any acts of faith, whereby we depend on Christ, for, saith he, it justifieth, because its in order of nature, the first that acts; certainly those frequent acts of faith which the godly after their conversion put forth, are not the first in nature, yet he expressly grants, *pag.* 16. Justification is applied to us upon the renewed acts of faith, yet these renewed acts of faith cannot be the first in order. Again, If it justifieth, because its the first that acts on Christ, then it justifieth as a work, and so fals in with those that he opposeth; If by acting on Christ, he mean receiving (for he speaks very obscurely) then he fals in with those, that say, it justifieth as an instrument, to whom notwithstanding he is an adversary. In the progresse of this reason he saith, faith justifieth only in respect of the sense and comfort, and assurance of Justification, which seemeth a great contradiction to a former passage in his Sermon, *pag.* 2. for he proveth the elect are not justified by God from all eternity: But why not? If faith be onely the sense of our Justification, this supposeth Justification to be before faith, and if it be but an hour before, it may be from eternity as well. Thus with him not only good works but faith also doth follow the person justified.

Use of Instruction. To give faith its proper place in Justification, not to exalt it too much, nor yet debase it too low, but above all things nourish the actings of it, because this receiveth Christ and Justification. If a labouring man loseth his hands, he is undone, because by them he liveth; faith is this hand; The *Israelite* that was blinde could not look on the brazen Serpent to be healed: faith is this eye; he faith that enricheth the soul, with one hand receiveth all from God, with the other hand sets all graces on work for God; So that we may with *Gerson* the Papist in a well explained sense, cry out, *Oh faith, thine is the kingdom, thine is the power and glory!*

SERM. XXVII.

That the whole Nature of Juſtification is not comprehended in Remiſſion and Forgiveneſſe of Sinnes.

ROM. 4.25.

Who was delivered for our offences, and was raiſed again for our Juſtification.

IN the former words we had this truth contained, *That Faith, not as it is a work, but becauſe of the object received and applied by it, is accounted to the believer for righteouſneſſe.* And this 25th *verſ.* will afford pregnant matter to prove, *That remiſſion of ſinnes is not all our Juſtification.* For whereas we have evinced, That neither faith nor works, nor any thing inherent in us, can be our righteouſneſſe, by which we are juſtified.

We come to grapple with thoſe, who grant our Juſtification to be without us, and yet for all that hit not the mark, and that which ſhall be mentioned at this time, is of thoſe, *who place the whole Nature of Juſtification in pardon of ſinne:* So that with them, forgiveneſſe of ſinne is that onely, and adequately, which maketh us juſt before God. But this we ſhall endeavour to overthrow from theſe words.

For the underſtanding whereof we may take notice of a two-fold

two-fold priviledge spoken of, with a two-fold cause; And lastly, The original and fountain, both of the causes and their effects.

The *two-fold cause* is *Christs death*, and *Christs resurrection*, for although it be true, That Christs merit is limited to the time of his humiliation, yet because his resurrection did manifest his power and conquest over all his enemies (for had he not risen his death had not availed to our happinesse) hence it is that Justification is attributed to his resurrection, although we may say, Christs death is the meritorious cause both of remission of sinnes and Justification, and Christs resurrection is in some sense the efficient cause, because by his rising again the Spirit of God doth make us capable of, and then bestoweth Justification upon us. The *two fold benefit* is set down in these words,

First, *Christ was delivered for our offences*, παραπτώματα, the word signifieth not every light sinne, or lesse fault, but that which is a falling, hereby intimating, that Christ died to take away our great transgressions as well as lesse: Even as the read Sea overwhelmed *Pharaoh* and the great men, as well as those of more weak and infirm natures: So that hereby we see Christ crucified an expiatory Sacrifice to take away the guilt of our offences.

The *second Benefit is our Justification*. This is made a distinct benefit from the former, even as Christs death and resurrection are distinguished, not that one can be divided from the other, onely one is not the other, or at least but a part of it.

Indeed the Popish Commentators do readily expound Justification for inward renovation, That Christ rose again that we might rise to newnesse of life, but they cannot shew the use of the word in that sense, yet that Justification is more then bare remission, the Apostle doth evidently manifest by the distinguishing of them. Now its greatly agitated by Divines, Why, or in what sense, Justification is thus attributed to Christs resurrection? Some explain it of the exemplar cause, and that two wayes:

1. That as sinne hath its death by Christs death, so we

are

are to have our resurrection and acceptation to life by his resurrection, insomuch that *Augustine* observeth, whatsoever was historically or really fulfilled in Christ, we are to have such a conformity to himself in our selves: as he was crucified, so we are to be to the world and sinne; as he was buried, so we are said to be buried with him in Baptism; and as he rose again, so we in our souls are to arise to all holinesse of life.

But secondly, Others expresse this exemplarity after this manner, *Christ* (say they) *in suffering was our Surety, God looked upon him as bearing our sinnes, and so we were condemned in him.* Again, *Christ rose as a publick and common person from the grave, and was acquitted thereupon from all the offences laid to his charge; and thus we were justified in his Justification.*

Lucius a learned Writer saith, *Justification is therefore attributed to Resurrection, because it was the compleat and ultimate act of Christs active obedience*; and from hence inferreth, *That Remission of sinne is attributed to his passive, and Justification to his active obedience.*

Others expound this of the final cause, *That the expiation of our sinnes was the end of his death, and Justification the end of his resurrection, and this is most probable, Only the meritorious causality in his death, for our forgivenesse, and the efficient causality of his Resurrection for our Justification is not to be excluded.*

Lastly, *Here is the original of all,* he was delivered, *viz.* by the Father, and he was raised, *viz.* by the Father. Thus whatsoever benefits comes by Christ, yea Christ himself is made the effect of his Fathers love and mercy to us: So that we have not the least reason to doubt, whether the Father will accept of what the Son hath done for us.

That which I shall pitch upon in these words is the distinction that is made between pardon of sin and Justification, and so observe,

Observ. *That the whole nature of Justification is not comprehended in remission and forgivenesse of sins.*

To clear this, consider first, That there are different opini-

ons

ons, not only between the Orthodox and their Adversaries, but also amongst the Orthodox themselves in this great priviledge of remission of sinnes; for some make Justification in the whole nature of it to lie in forgivenesse of sinnes. Thus *Piscator* and *Wotton* with all diligence set themselves to assert this, and many others, who deny the imputation of Christs active obedience to the believer (I say many) for some though they deny the imputation of Christs active obedience, yet grant Justification to be more then remission, herein forsaking *Piscator*. (M^r *Gataker*, *Animad in Luc.*) *Bellarmine* would charge this upon *Calvin*, as his different opinion from other Protestants, but it may be easily cleared, that *Calvin* doth by placing our Justification in remission of sinne, onely oppose inherent renovation against the Papists, not the imputed righteousnesse of Christ, witnesse his exposition on this Text, beside other places.

Indeed *Vorstius* while Orthodox doth say, (*Antibel. de Justif.*) If we place Justification only in remission of sins, we may the more easily answer all the Popish Objections, neither shall we then be so obnoxious to their malignant calumnies.

2. Others they make remission of sinne not to be any part, much lesse the whole of Justification, but the effect and result of it. Thus for the satisfaction of Christ, we being accounted just before God, thereby we come to have remission of sinnes. There are learned men go this way (*Bradshaw*, *Gataker*.)

3. The Popish Writers they make remission of sinne a concomitant of our Justification, which they place in our internal renovation.

Lastly, There are those who make remission of sinnes an integral part of our Justification; for they say, The whole nature of Justification consists in these two parts, remission of sinne and imputation of righteousnesse, which indeed of these hath the priority, is disputed, but that is not much material. And surely if we regard the expressions of the Scripture, this seemeth to have most truth in it, and with these later, I joyn my self. Neither may it seem such an ab-

surd thing to plate Justification in two particulars, as if the form of it ought necessarily to be single, for we are not to speak of Justification, as natural forms which consist in *indivisibili*, but we are to look upon it as a favour and priviledge of God, which he vouchsafeth to his children, and to the integral constituting whereof there may be as many ingredients, as God shall put in, neither are imputation of righteousnesse, and remission of sins so disparate, but that they may well concur to one thing.

Wherein remission of sins and justification differ.

In the next place, *Let us consider wherein remission of sinnes and Justification do differ.* And

1. First, *They differ as an whole and a part, Justification is the whole, remission is a part; So that as the soul of a man and a man differ, so the whole and the part. Thus doth forgivenesse of sinne and Justification.* Hence the Scripture, as it sometimes describeth Justification by *the pardon of sinne*; so it doth also by the *imputing of righteousnesse*, Rom. 14. Neither may they be called the same thing, as the expulsion of darknesse and introduction of light, for they are two distinct benefits, and although they are inseparable, yet they are not to be confounded, and although where there is forgivenesse of sinne, there is imputation of righteousnesse, yet this makes not them all one, but argueth that inseparable connexion which God hath appointed; Even as remission of sinnes, and inherent renovation of the soul are individually joyned together; Take one away, and you take the other; and yet they are not the same work of God, but two distinct mercies; and the reason why Justification doth comprehend these two is, because the Apostle makes blessednesse to belong to him that is justified, *Rom.* 4. and *Rom.* 5. 1. *Being justified, we have peace with God.* Now to have sinne meerly forgiven, although by Gods gracious appointment it doth *de facto* bring blessednesse, yet this ariseth not simply because sinne is forgiven, but because he is accepted of as positively just, and as having done that which the Law requireth, to which onely the blessing of eternal life is promised; for who can deny but that God might have simply pardoned a sinner his sinne, and yet for all that have annihilated him, or continued his life

for some thousands of years in temporal happinesse, and at last to have ceased to be, and not at all to give eternal life to him. As the Jews had their sinnes pardoned, were brought back to their Countrey, but not in such Glory, Power and Dignity, as formerly. Thus God (to speak of his absolute Power, and not what he hath promised to do) might have forgiven sinne to the humbled sinner, that is, he might have taken off the guilt or obligation to eternal punishment, and yet for all that not set the Crown of Glory upon his head, and whereas it is said, This cometh by Adoption, and not Justification, that is but *gratis dictum*, and cannot be proved, seeing that the justified man is thereby put into a full possession of Gods favour, and *whom he hath justified, he will glorifie*; and indeed Justification is virtually all other priviledges, for they are either Effects, or Concomitants, and Consequents of it.

Secondly, *Justification doth connote a state, and established condition of a man, and therefore is not frequently iterated, although it be continued.* A man is not justified many times in a day, though sinnes be pardoned often in a day. It is true, God doth continue to justifie those that believe in him, and if he should cease to do so, they would immediately fall into misery and guilt; but yet God doth not renew or revive our Justification, as if there were an interruption or intermission of it. That Justification doth denote an estate, is plain by comparing it with all the other priviledges God vouchsafeth his people; Regeneration and Vocation denote a state the person is put into, so doth Glorification. As therefore Sanctification is one thing, and those auxiliary actings of Gods grace are another thing; So that though we may say, Such a man hath new quickning grace every day, yet we cannot say, He hath a new Regeneration; So it is here, though we may say, That every day the believer, begging the pardon of his daily infirmities, hath a new pardon, yet he hath not a new Justification, because this denominateth the state of a man. Neither can it be said, That

pardon of this sinne or that sinne, puts a man into the state of Gods favour absolutely, but *quoad hoc*, the pardon of this or that sinne doth not make that universall righteousnesse of the person, whereby he stands acquitted from all. It is true, some learned men call this daily remission of sinne, *Justificatio particularis*; but we are now treating of that universal Justification, whereby the person of a believer stands acquitted, and disobliged from the guilt of all his sinnes he hath committed, and great is the comfort of a Christian in that his Justification is a state of favour with God, for hence flow many other inestimable benefits and advantages, which the believer is to study out and improve.

3. Thirdly, *Even amongst men, we see there is a great difference between forgivenesse of sinne and Justification, one may be where the other is not.* As if a man be accused before a Judge falsly for such and such crimes, and he is able to free himself before the Judge, upon this he is justified, and yet we cannot say, his fault was forgiven him. Again, We see in *Josephs* brethren, and *Shimei's* reviling of *David*, there was a forgivenesse of their fault, but there was no Justification of them; and although according to Gods gracious order, which he hath now established, he doth not forgive any mans sinnes properly, whom he doth not justifie, that is, accept to eternal life; yet, as was said before, absolutely he might have done otherwise; So because God had vouchsafed one mercy, he was not bound to adde more, I say, forgive sinnes properly, because sometimes in Scripture the taking away of a temporal punishment, is called a forgivenesse of sinnes; and this even wicked men, as *Ahab*, have been partakers of, at least a delay of the punishment, when yet they have been obnoxious to eternal wrath. Its plain then, they cannot be the same, when one may be, where the other is not.

4. Fourthly, *They differ in this respect, which is of great concernment, Remission of sinne doth onely take away the guilt, or ordination of it to eternal punishment, it doth not remove*

remove the sinne it self. So that although pardon of sinne doth make as if sinne had never been in respect of the guilt of it, yet not in respect of the denomination of the Subject. Though *David* had his sinnes of murder and adultery pardoned, yet that pardon did not make *David* a just man in those acts, his murder was truly murder, his adultery was truely adultery, although the guilt and actual condemnation of them was taken away; whereas Justification doth denominate a man just, righteousnesse is required to Justification, as well as wisdome to make a man wise, health to make a man healthfull: a man cannot be justified, *viz.* truely, without a righteousnesse: So that a man is not justified, and therefore just, but just and therefore justified. Its true, this righteousnesse, whereby we are pronounced just, is not in our selves, because we have sinne and corruption abiding in us, but it is purchased for us by the Lord Christ, and what he hath done is accepted of, as if we had done it our own selves.

Fifthly, *Remission of sinne and Justification differ in this consideration. In forgivenesse of sinne there is* ablatio mali; *in Justification there is* collatio boni: *when sinne is forgiven the eternal evil deserved is removed, but when we are justified eternal good is promised.* Neither is it of any strength at all, to say, where all evil is removed in a subject capable all good is introduced. If a man shall not be damned, he must be saved; for this is granted, that they are inseparable, but this doth not follow *ex naturâ rei*, but extrinsecally by the order and appointment of God; for a man might not have been damned, and yet after some enjoyments of pleasures on the earth, have been annihilated, and never assumed to eternal glory. Certainly, when the Papists tell us of a *Limbus Patrum*, especially of their *Infantum*, who are neither damned, or yet ever shall be saved. Our Divines do not argue against it as an impossible thing, that God might not have done so, if he would, but only they say, its against Scripture, and Gods revealed will, that he will appoint such a third place. 5.

This therefore is a perpetual mistake, That because God hath appointed these two inseparably together, freedome from hell, and enjoyment of heaven; Therefore to make them all one, and to be the effect of one act of God. As it is in Sanctification, the removing of spiritual darknesse, and vouchsafing spiritual illumination is the same motion, with respect onely to divers terms, and this from a natural and extrinsecal necessity, but it is not thus in our Justification, he that is not damned is not from an intrinsecal necessity therefore saved, but because God hath joyned these things together. When the Papist shall urge, That wheresoever pardon of sinne is, there is infusion of righteousnesse, and shall demand us to give an instance of any such, who were forgiven, and yet not made holy; We answer, That it is freely confessed that both these are necessary concomitants; No man is justified but he is sanctified, yet these are not one act and work of Gods Spirit, but distinct mercies, and wrought in a distinct manner. Thus we may see wherein the difference between these two may be discovered; and that Text *Acts* 13. 38, 39. seemeth to encline this way; for when he had said, That by Christ was forgivenesse of sinnes, he addeth, as a further priviledge, *And by him all that beleeve are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses.* But *Daniel* speaks more expressely, *Chap.* 9. 24. There the *Messias* is said *to make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousnesse*: Whether this be imputed righteousnesse, I do not here dispute; only you see these are made two distinct benefits, expiation of sinne, and bringing in everlasting righteousnesse. And thus *to abolish death*, and *to bring life and immortality to light*, are mentioned as two distinct effects of the Lord Christ our Saviour, 2 *Tim.* 1. 10. And indeed there seemeth to be great reason for it, because its not enough for us that our sinnes are pardoned, but it behoveth us to bring such a perfect obedience as the Law requireth; Now seeing we in our own persons cannot do this, that our Justification may be com-

complear and full, its necessary his obedience to the Law, should be accounted as ours. But this reason is to be improved more largely, and vindicated from all opposition, when we treat of Christs active obedience.

Reasons against this point examined.

Let us therefore take into consideration what choise and special reasons are brought against this Position, and why its affirmed, *That all our Justification is comprised in remission of sinne.*

And that which is much pressed upon, is *Rom.* 4. 6, 7, 8. where the Apostle proving, That a righteousnesse is imputed to us without works; for a confirmation hereof, alledgeth a testimony from *Davids* Psalm, where the man is said *to be blessed that hath his sinnes forgiven him*; Now (say they) the Apostles Argument would not be good, if imputation of righteousnesse, and remission of sinne were not all one.

From this manner of *Pauls* Argumentation, the Question is, Whether the Apostle give an whole definition of Justification, or describe it onely Synecdochically, one part for the whole? But there seemeth no reason why the Apostle should be here thought to describe all the nature of Justification; its enough if he brings that part of it, which will strongly and clearly prove his purpose. Now the truth *Paul* was to prove is, That a man is not justified by works, Why? Because *David* saith, *Blessed is the man to whom sinne is forgiven, and his iniquities covered*; If therefore blessednesse lie in remission of sinne, in Gods gracious favour without us; then it cannot be in any works we do. Thus the Apostles coherence is clear and evident, but whether this be all the nature of Justification is not material, if remission of sinne be in our Justification, though it be not all of it, the Argument abideth firm. Although we may probably conclude, That the Apostle, though he onely mention pardon of sinne, yet includeth also imputation of righteousnesse, because he makes Blessednesse to consist in this remission: Now blessednesse and eternal life is not promised because sinne is forgiven meerly, but because there is such a righteousnesse

nesse as answereth the Law, Christs doing and suffering being imputed to us, That as blessednesse is not in a meer privation of evil, but positive affluence of all good: So Justification is not a meer blotting out of sinne, but investing us with such a righteousnesse that hath eternal life annexed to it. Neither may we wonder why the Apostle should not mention imputation of righteousnesse, as well as remission of sinnes, seeing his scope is not to inform what Justification is, but how we are justified. And again, the mentioning of one must necessarily inferre the other; for sinne cannot be pardoned unlesse a righteousnesse accepted of by God be made ours, and because of that therefore our iniquities to be done away; yea some presse the very mentioning of imputing of righteousnesse, *vers.6.* as a distinct thing from remission, and yet the Apostle (they say) doth well argue from one to another, because they are inseparably joyned together, and he that hath one must necessarily have the other: Even (as some say) our Saviour proved the Resurrection of the dead, by proving the Immortality of the soul, because one followeth the other, *Mat.*22.32. and although they may seem to be of a different nature, yet one as a part may be well put for the whole, as the soul of a man, or the body of a man is sometimes put for the whole man.

As for the Papist, who would from *Davids* testimony prove inherent righteousnesse to be part of our Justification, because its added [*In whose spirit there is no guile*] that cannot be, because it would directly contradict the Apostles intent, which is to prove a righteousnesse without works; so that those words are brought in, to shew the qualification of the subject who is justified, not a part of our Justification.

Serm.

SERM. XXVIII.

ROM. 4.25.

Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our Justification.

WE have asserted this truth, *That Justification is not wholly comprehended in remission of sinne:* And did in part answer that famous place the Adversaries so much insist upon, *viz. Pauls* Argumentation, *Rom.*4.6. which (say they) could not be solid were it not built upon this Rock, *That imputation of righteousnesse and remission of sinne were all one.* Nevertheless because this place is accounted of like the Jebusites Fort in *Zion*, such a strong hold, that if you take that you take all, 2 *Sam.*5.6.

I shall add some further considerations to clear this point, and some other Objections they bring (deferring the rest till we treat of Christs active obedience.) And

First, Some have thought, *That the Apostle doth not argue from the definition to the thing defined, but* ab imparium collatione; *as if the Apostle had intended thus, If remission of sinne be without our works, we are not sufficient of our selves, by any thing we do to obtain pardon of sinne, much lesse can we think to be justified by any work we perform.* Thus *Chrysostome* who from hence makes Justification to be a greater matter then meer forgivenesse. Whether this be a true analytical exposition of the place, I shall not dispute; onely this is true, which he saith, *That Justification is a greater and more noble priviledge, then meer forgivenesse of sinne*; and the Reason is, Because pardon of sinne doth not make a man just, 1.

there must be an imputation of righteousnesse to do that, and besides the removing of the guilt of sinne, we need an entituling of us to eternal glory. Hence to the former Texts mentioned, we may adde *Acts* 26. 18. where *forgivenesse of sinnes* and *an inheritance* are made two distinct benefits, and so though they alwaies concurre together, yet are never to be confounded: So that the foundation the contrary minded lay, is wholly unsound, which is, *That by remission of sinne we are made righteous*, which is not a truth; for (as hath been shewed) all that pardon of sinne doth, is to remove the guilt of it, and to take away that actuall ordination of it to eternal punishment, it doth not make us righteous, we need an imputation of the righteousnesse of Christ for this; and although upon the remission of sinne followeth eternal life and glory, yet this is not *vi consequentiæ*, but *consequentiæ*, its not from any natural resultancy, but from Gods gracious appointment: So that *Chrysostome* might well argue, *If by our works we cannot attain to forgivenesse of sinne, much lesse to our justification.*

But in the second place grant, *That the Apostle doth not argue* ab imperium collatione, *yet there is no necessity he should argue* a definitione *and* definitum, *as if the Apostle had here intended a full and plenary definition of Justification.* There is no probable Argument for this; for if remission of sinne and imputation of righteousnesse, are inseparable consequents of one another, so that from the nature of the one, we may argue to the nature of the other, This is enough to confirm the Apostles intent, Righteousnesse is imputed without works: Why? because remission of sinne which is a part of our righteousnesse, that we stand justified by, is without works, as *David* speaks peremptorily: Whereas then its ordinarily objected, That use doth not admit, or can it be a Synecdoche to say, one part is for another, especially when of a different nature.

It may be answered first, That one part is not here put for another, but a part for the whole, Remission of sinne for Justification, part of our Righteousnesse for our whole Righteousnesse, as the soul or the body are sometimes

times put for the whole man. Or,

Secondly, Here is not one part put for another onely, because here is an inseparable conjunction of both these, that one is alwayes where the other is: God never forgiveth sinne, where he doth not impute righteousnesse. Therefore we may well conclude from one to the other, even as the Apostle all along makes Justification by faith, and to be justified by Christ, or by grace, all one, because they are indispensably coupled together.

Thirdly, Consider to the clearing of this, and all other Objections, *That to Justification there is necessarily required Justice or Righteousnesse.* A man cannot be justified without righteousnesse, any more then be wise without wisdome, or holy without holinesse: So that Justice is the abstract or forme, Justification is the application or communication of it to such a Subject: As *learning* is a form or quality, but when applied to such a man it denominateth him in the concrete a learned man. Thus it is here, Righteousnesse is the quality, and when this is applied to a man, he is said to be made righteous or justified: Insomuch that there cannot be a true and laudable Justification, where Righteousnesse is not supposed; and hence it is, that Remission of sinne and Imputation of Righteousnesse must be two distinct things, for Remission of sinnes simply as so, doth not give a Righteousnesse. It is true, that is a known saying of the Ancient, *Justitia nostra est indulgentia Dei*, Our Righteousnesse is Gods indulgence; but that is to be understood, because according to Gods appointment, these two will go together, righteousnesse and forgiveneesse of sinne, not indeed our own righteousnesse, but that which God hath appointed for us through Christ. 3.

Fourthly, Yet to clear this further, take notice, *That till we be accounted as righteous, God cannot, God will not in any gracious manner communicate himself to us, he cannot love or delight but in a righteous person.* All those promises of a gracious and familiar presence, are still to such as are accounted righteous. Hence those engagements which God is pleased to take upon himself to give everlasting happinesse, are 4.

alwaies to those persons that have fulfilled the Law. Eternal life cannot be vouchsafed to any, but where the Law hath been fulfilled; Now because we could not do that, therefore Christs obedience is made ours. Hence *Rom.* 5. *By the obedience of Christ many are said to be made righteous*, Though therefore the works of the Law are excluded from our Justification in respect of our own persons, yet not as performed by Christ for us; Therefore Christ is called *The end of the Law for righteousnesse to him that believeth*, Rom. 10.4. Christ did not come to destroy the Law, neither in the doctrinal part, or in the obligatory part of it. Hence *Rom.* 8. 34. Christ is said *to come in the flesh, condemning sinne, that the Righteousnesse of the Law might be fulfilled in us*; for this purpose it is that *Gal.* 4. 4. Christ is said *to be under the Law*. Now in all these obediences unto the Law, he was not for himself; All that he did and suffered was for us, yea and in our stead: So that though we have not our salvation by that rule, *Do this and live*, yet Christ procured it for us, by fulfilling that, God being an holy and righteous God, never promised eternal Salvation, but to such as had obeyed his Law, either in themselves, or in their Sureties; and if Gods Justice would not dispense with a pœnal satisfaction to the Law, as they themselves confesse against *Socinus*, Why should he dispense with the true and proper obedience to his Law, seeing that punishment is required, and become due onely *per accidens*, but obedience is required unto Gods Law primarily, and in it self: God then requiring a perfect Righteousnesse, and promising eternal life onely unto that, its necessary that there should be a Saviour, who should be a Saviour, who should not onely expiate our sinne, but bring in a perfect and absolute righteousnesse. It behoveth the Adversaries of this Doctrine to prove, That God will not dispense with a pœnal righteousnesse (if we may so properly call it) but he will with an active righteousnesse: but of this more in its time.

35 Fifthly, *If therefore God require a positive righteousnesse of us, conformable unto his Law, in the perfect obligation of it, then it followeth, that meer remission of sinne under any distinction whatso-*

whatsoever, cannot be our righteousnesse. We cannot be said to be righteous in this sense, as thereby to be interessed unto eternal life, unlesse we have either an inherent or imputed righteousnesse. The distinctions are brought to clear their Assertion, That a man may be just meerly by remission of sinne.

1. They distinguish between a man Just *qualitatively* and *legally*. A man that hath his sinnes pardoned cannot be Just *qualitatively*, for this supposeth he hath sinned, and therefore is not inherently Just; but then *legally* righteous a man is said to be, who though he hath offended, yet compensation is made to the Law. Now (say they) in this Evangelical pardon of sinne, a man is looked upon in and through Christ his Surety, as having satisfied the Law. Now where the Law cannot accuse, there must needs be righteousnesse. But although this be specious, yet a man cannot be called legally Just meerly because of this Satisfaction made, because Remission of sinnes, for which this atonement is, doth onely take away the guilt, and the ordination of a man to punishment, as was formerly said, a man is still unjust and a sinner; in respect of the filth and demerit of it, sinne doth still abide even when it is pardoned (at least original sinne.) Therefore its maintained against Papists, That forgivenesse of sin is not the aboli ion of it, that it doth not take away the *Maculam*, but the *Reatum*: If then the sinfulnesse of original sinne remain in a believer, though the guilt of it be taken away, How can eternal happinesse belong to such, unles otherwise they be accounted of as perfectly righteous, or having an obedience answerable to the Law? So that Remission of sinne doth not make a man legally Just in an absolute and universal sense. Indeed the distinction it self is necessary (though not in that sense the Authours propound it,) for the Orthodox maintain against Papists, That we are not Just by a *qualitative* righteousnesse, but a legal one; by a legal, meaning the imputed Righteousnesse of Christ, which by Gods appointment, is accepted of, as if we had done it in our own persons. But remission of sinne is not all this legal Righteousnesse; for

though by Christs death Satisfaction be made to the penalty of the Law, yet not to the obedience of it; and to speak properly, a man is not obliged by way of duty to the penalty, but to the command; for we cannot properly say, Its the duty of the devils and impenitent wicked men to be damned.

Another distinction introduced much to the same purpose is, of a two-fold pardon,

1. A meer absolute and simple pardon, such as we are commanded to shew unto others, of which the Lords Prayer speaketh.

Or secondly, A pardon acquired by Satisfaction, and obtained by a just compensation. Now its true (say they) That in meer simple pardons there cannot be any Righteousnesse, yea the contrary is there supposed, but in pardons by Satisfaction, thus is a righteousnesse procured; But this will fall to the ground upon the same reason with the former, pardon by Satisfaction would be a compleat righteousnesse, if that were all, which is required; if so be that Christ had procured such an atonement, that the Law should be no longer obliging of us, that we should be free from all obedience, that the Law should cease to be a Law to us, then this Satisfaction would be our full Righteousnesse. But Christ died not for this end, to disoblige us from God, neither though he satisfied the comminatory part of the Law, did he therefore invalidate the mandatory part? And who in reason can think, that because man fallen is redeemed by a Saviour, that therefore the Law should not still continue prescribing obedience unto it? But I must not anticipate my self, for this is to be more fully cleared hereafter.

6. Sixthly, *Although we say Remission of sinne doth not make a man just, yet it is not necessary that we should assign a third, or a neutral estate of a man, that is neither just nor unjust.* For this is perpetually urged, as a grand absurdity, Forgivenesse takes away the guilt of sinne, and freeth from hell, and yet it doth not make a man just, nor entitle to heaven.

Therefore

Therefore (say they) *a man may be in Gods account, neither a sinner, nor yet a righteous person; neither in the state of death nor life; whereas these are immediate contraries, and so in a subject capable one must necessarily be put. As in the air, there must be light or darkness, a man must be either alive or dead. Its true, where the subject is not capable, there neither of these immediate contraries are inherent: A beast is neither just nor unjust; A stone is neither sinfull or holy, because these are not subjects susceptible of such qualities; But man is the proper and immediate subject, and therefore we may conclude, If not a sinner, then just; If not to be damned, then to be saved.* *Object.*

In this Argument they much triumph, this is the *Goliahs* Sword. But

First, We do not *(de facto)* say, there is or was any such neutral and indifferent state, wherein men were neither righteous nor unrighteous, neither damned or saved. Indeed the Papists they speak of mans pure naturals, such an estate wherein he is neither good nor evil, till by his free-will he made himself so; and thus they say, *Adam* was created, and therefore original Righteousnesse was supernatural, and put as a bridle to him, to keep the inferiour part from rebelling against the Superiour. And the *Socinians* they tell us, of a middle and neutral state *Adam* was created in, which they call innocency, as if he had no more knowledge or understanding in him, then a meer childe. And for a middle state between heaven and hell, The Papists do *(de facto)* assigne, by their *Limbus Patrum* and *Infantum*; Yea all those in Antiquity, which are thought to be many, that hold the souls did not go immediately into heaven; and such as of later dayes that maintain *Psuchopannuchia*, they do hold, That for a time at least there is a state wherein the godly are neither fully happy or miserable. And the *Socinians* do *(de facto)* also give a middle estate between *Pœnam damni* and *Sensus*, and that is a state of annihilation. Thus you see there have been, and are of late, who thought it no inimaginable thing, to make such an estate actually to be. *Answ.*

Now

Now if you change the Question, and make it not, Whether God hath appointed such a middle state and condition (for it is plain he hath revealed the contrary) but, Whether by his absolute power he could not have done it, there would not a negative answer be hastily returned.

In the second place, There are many things are not the same in their essence, and yet for their existency are inseparable; so that it would be unreasonable to demand the separation of them. Do not those of the contrary Judgement say, Remission of sinne and inward Renovation are not the same things, that they are two distinct benefits? Yet if the Papists should demand of them, that they should assigne such a middle estate, of one whose sinnes are truly pardoned, and yet not inwardly renewed, would not the answer be, They are inseparable in their existence, though distinct in their essence? Thus a substance is really distinguished from its accidents, yet we say against the Papists, that it cannot subsist without them, though they run to Gods power to maintain their miraculous Transubstantiation.

To instance in a third thing, Doe not the Orthodox say, That faith alone justifieth, though it be not alone, that its not *Solitaria*, though *Sola* in the act of justifying? This being the truth of God, we matter not the Papist expostulating, Why faith may not be separated from charity? What repugnancy this is for faith being divided from other graces to justifie? By these instances we see, that its no new thing, for several things to be indispensably and individually conjoyned together: So that we cannot say, one can be without the other, though we may truely say, one is not the other. Thus though to have sinne forgiven, cannot according to the order God hath now established, be without righteousnesse, yet that is not because they are the same thing in nature.

Thirdly, But that which we conceive to be the full and plenary answer is, That righteousnesse and sinne, life and death, in the sense controverted, are not immediate-

ly

ly and naturally contrariez: But in a moral sense, by the appointment and arbitrary Will of God; so that if he had pleased, he might have ordained it otherwise. So that Righteousnesse and sinne, though in a Subject capable, are not naturally contrary, as light and darknesse is, crooked and straight, naturall life and naturall death, which in their proper Subjects do necessarily inferre the existence of one at that time, if it be not day, it must be night, it is not one motion, that makes the stick straight, and another not crooked; he that takes life from a man, doth thereby necessarily kill him, it cannot be hindred. But it is not thus in the state controverted, because

In the first place, Remission of sinne doth not make a man no sinner, perfect Sanctification doth this, or imputed Righteousnesse. It hath been often said, That by forgivenesse of sinne a man doth not cease to be a sinner, but to be obnoxious to eternall punishment: So that to be righteous in the controversie, is not to have habituall Holinesse, to which sinne is an immediate contrary, but so be judged righteous by the Obedience which another hath done for us. Hence it is, that while a man is accounted of by God, as righteous through Christ, yet at the same time he hath sinne and corruption cleaving to him, which God seeth and chastiseth him for. So that, as is to be shewed, it is but a calumny to fasten that Antinomian Position, Of God seeing no sinne in his people, upon the Doctrine of Imputed Righteousnesse. This Viper can no more cleave to that, then to the Doctrine of Satisfaction by the death of Christ, as is more largely to be shewed. 1.

In the second place, Though life and death be contraries in a naturall consideration, yet the life and death understood in the controversie, are made contraries onely by Gods appointment, and so they are opposite by an externall appointment; for the life we speak of is that heavenly and glorious life which God of his goodnesse 2.

will bestow on those that are his, and therefore cannot follow by naturall resultancy upon the death removed, that God hath threatned; for though God in Mercy would not damne a man, yet it doth not necessarily follow, That therefore he must give him such a life, as that glorious being in Heaven; for either he might have destroyed him, or if he had perpetuated his life, it might have been, as some Divines say, *Adam* would have been partaker of, had he continued in Obedience (*viz.*) an happy blessed life here on earth: So that though our life and our death, which are natural, be immediate contraries, yet the eternall death and eternall life are so from the appointment of God only, and then no wonder, seeing they are two distinct benefits, if they be produced by two distinct causes.

To these things we may adde that instance of *Adam*, which the learned mention; for *Adam*, though he was not indeed created in a middle neutrall estate, but after the Image of God in Holinesse, yet though free from the guilt of sinne, he had not a right to eternall life, for that was upon his perfect and persevering Obedience: So that in him we have a clear proof, That a man may be without the guilt of sinne, he was not in a state of wrath, and yet he was not entituled to Heaven, and eternall Glory. And this is acknowledged in effect by the Adversary, who saith, That eternall Glory cometh not by Justification, but Adoption, then all their own Arguments will be retorted upon themselves; for by Remission of sinne a man is delivered from all evil, and yet this is not enough to make him happy without Adoption: They may as well say, All Adoption lieth in Remission of sinne, as well as all Justification. But howsoever they deny this eternall life to be by Justification, yet the Apostle doth expressely attribute it to this priviledge, *Rom.* 5. 18. where it is called *Justification to life*: So that as condemnation doth include eternal death, thus Justification must eternal life.

I shall

I shall conclude this with *Admonition*, to desire the sense and feeling of this Justification in our selves, as well as the distinct knowledge of it. What if thou art able to confute all Adversaries, and to free the Truth from all accusation? Thou canst justifie this Justification, and yet art not justified thy self: But if thou art made partaker of it, then do thou with all thankfulnesse and joy break out into the praises of that great God, who hath thus justified thee. *Use.*

O o 2 SECT.

SECT. V.

Of the Imputation of the Righteousnesse of Christ both Passive and Active.

SERM. XXIX.

That a Believers Righteousnes is Imputed. Divers Propositions about Imputation of Good and Evil, and of Christs Righteousnes in particular.

ROM. 4. 11.

And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousnes of the Faith, which he had being yet uncircumcised----that righteousnes might be imputed to them also.

THe Apostle having fully demonstrated, how we are to be justified, he now proceeds to shew who they are that are thus justified; he passeth from the Manner to the Subject; for whereas it might be objected, That this instance of *Abraham* might not at all belong to the *Gentiles*, because

because he was *circumcised*; in this verse he sheweth, That *Abraham* received the sign of this righteousnesse of faith, while he was *uncircumcised*, and therefore circumcision and uncircumcision did not vary this matter.

In the words observe five.

1. *Circumcision* described.
2. From the generall nature of it, *a sign and seal*.
3. From the signified grace, *The righteousnesse of faith*.
4. From the subject, *Abraham received it*.
5. From the exemplaries of this, this did not belong to *Abraham* alone, but to believers both circumcised and uncircumcised, *That righteousnesse might be imputed to them also*.

Though learned men do much discusse the former part, founding the true Nature and Definition of Sacraments thereupon, yet my purpose is only to insist on the last clause, (*That righteousnesse might be imputed to them also*.)

Wonder not, if for the demonstration of the Nature of Justification, most of my Texts are taken out of this Epistle to the *Romans*, for here is the properest of that Doctrine; and therefore *Melanthon* was wont to call this Epistle to the *Romans*, *The Confession of the Reformed Churches*. Now this fourth Chapter doth expressly speak of an imputed righteousnesse, its no where so evidently and purposedly treated on, as in this place; for the Apostle doth at least eight times mention this phrase of imputing or accounting righteousnesse: what is implied in this phrase, shall be opened in handling the Doctrine, which is,

That the righteousnesse of the believer hath is imputed. It is an accounted or reckoned righteousnesse to him, it is not that which he hath inherently in himself, but God through Christ doth esteem of him as if he had it, and so deals with him as wholly righteous. This is a *Passive* righteousnesse, not an *Active* righteousnesse; a righteousnesse we receive, not that we do. To understand this, consider many Propositions.

Doct.

First, *That this Doctrine of imputed righteousnesse is by all sorrowful persons judged to be like the abomination of desolation.*

...However heretical persons contradict one another in other things, yet against this they are unanimously conspiring. It is well enough known what reproaches and works are put upon it by the Popish party, calling it the putative and chimerical righteousnesse. The *Socinians* they abominate it. The *Confessians* flout at it, saying, they have an imputed learning, and imputed modesty, that hold imputed righteousnesse. The *Arminians*, though they grant faith to be accounted for righteousnesse, (ie to say, Christs righteousnesse to be imputed to us,) they think to be an idol of the Protestants brain, and say, it no where expressed in Scripture. But no wonder that the *Ægyptians* (as I may so say) should rise up against it, when the *Israelites* fight against one another concerning it; of which more in its time. Let this satisfie us, That the Scripture doth thus often mention an imputed righteousnesse, and therefore should not be matter of reproach, but worthy of all acceptation; and certainly, seeing none of us have such an inherent righteousnesse within our selves, as is able to endure before so perfect and holy a God, We ought greatly to rejoyce in the goodnesse and mercy of God, who hath provided such glorious robes for us, that when we were wholly naked and undone, yet hath procured a righteousnesse for us, that neither men or Angels could bring about.

2. Secondly, *Consider what the word answering this imputing, viz. the Hebrew* Chashab, *and in the Greek* λογιζεσθαι, *of which the former, viz. the Hebrew, say some to this, That though the words in the general signifie to think, to reason, to imagine, &c. yet very frequently it is used to account or reckon by way of computation, as Arithmeticians use to do; so that it is, as it were, a judgement past upon a thing, when all Reasons or Arguments are thought together.* And from this it is applied to signifie any kinds of accounting or reckoning; and in this sense, imputation is taken here for God's accounting and accounting of us righteous. Therefore when the *Schoolmen* make *imputare*, to be as much as the *infusion* or putting of righteousnesse into us, or *impietas* is to cut off; or the Papists to make it an infusion of holy qualities, they go as farre

from

from the Iebb of the word, as the Iust is from rehu Weslo.

Thirdly, Although some learned men are very prolix and large in distributing of this imputation, and making several kindes of it, yet that which is most proper and fit to our controversie in hand is, *That to impute, is to account, or reckon a man such a thing, or cause of it, which he hath not, or hath, whether it be good or evil.* Imputation doth not alwayes imply an absence, or a want of the thing, as *Arminius* would have it; nor is it alwayes of that which is good and blessed, it may be of that which is evil, and to be punished, sins are imputed as well as righteousnesse. 3.

Sinne may be imputed two wayes.

Now a sinne or the evil of it, may be imputed two wayes;

1. Justly and righteously, when any man hath indeed committed such a sinne that is imputed to him; *Cains* murder of *Abel* was imputed to him, and whosoever man, till God pardon his sinne, it is imputed to him; *Psal.* 32. All impenitent sinners have their sinnes imputed to them, though others, or they themselves will not reckon themselves sinners, yet God will; and this imputation of sinne after a just manner may be, when a man though he hath not expressely sinned such a sinne, yet by interpretation, or some other equivalent respect, he is said to do it. To this purpose may be brought that place discussed so much by Interpreters, *Levit.* 17. 4. where the words saith, *That if any man kill any Beast, Lamb, or an offering, and do not bring it to the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, blood shall be imputed to that man, he hath shed blood*; That is, say some Expositors, That if a man do not keep to Gods order and command in the Sacrifices and worship he appointed, it is as grievous a sinne, as if he had committed murder, as if he had killed a man; and this imputation by way of equivalency, is often amongst men. 4.

2. In the second place, There is an imputation of evil, or the cause of it unjustly, when that is accounted upon a mans score, which yet he is not guilty of. Thus *David* said, *They laid to his charge things he never did*; and thus evil Judges when

when they condemn the innocent, as *Pilate* did Christ, and the Jews charging him with such crimes that he was not guilty of, did impute sin unjustly.

In the second place, There is an imputing or accounting a good thing unto a man,

Justly and righteously, as when the Apostle saith, *Rom.* 4. *To him that worketh, his reward is reckoned of debt.* Thus if there were any perfect fulfillers of the Law, eternall glory would be reckoned unto them, as the just reward of their labours.

2. There is an imputation of good unjustly and unrighteously, and that is, when an ungodly Judge shall acquit a guilty person against Law, or as when the *Israelites* did impute all the plenty and abundance they had to their Idolatry, because they did worship the Queen of heaven.

3. There is an imputation by grace, which is, when righteousnesse and reward is accounted to an offender, not of debt, but of grace, yet having just and weighty causes for such an absolution and Justification. And this is the proper way of our Gospel-imputation. He that is ungodly (as the Apostle speaketh) *Rom.* 4. is justified, God doth account him as righteous, though a sinner in himself, not of debt; for, How can he that deserveth to be damned, deserve to be saved, but of meer grace? yet that this grace might have a free passage, and not impeach his justice and holinesse, Christ became an atonement for us, and made himself an expiation for our sins, and hereby God might appear both merciful and just. This is the righteousnesse imputed, that a believer is wholly to rest upon.

4. Fourthly, *The Scripture speaketh but of a two-fold imputation, in reference to our matter in hand, an imputation of debt, and an imputation according to grace.* This distinction you have *Rom.* 4. 4. *To him that worketh the reward is accounted of debt:* Though some may think that imputation is here taken improperly, yet that is upon a false supposition, as if imputation did alwayes suppose some *indebitum* where it was: but that is not so, 2 *Tim.* 4. 16. *Paul* there prayeth concerning such who forsook him, that it be not laid

laid to their charge, that it be not *imputed* to them. 2. The Apostle mentioneth an imputation of grace, and that is most remarkably seen in the Gospel, our sinnes being imputed to Christ, and his righteousnesse to us, God doth not absolutely and simply of meer grace pronounce us righteous, but Christ is become our Surety, and so as in the first *Adam* we are made sinners; thus in the second *Adam* we are made righteous; This is the wonderful grace of God, herein were the manifold riches of his wisdome seen, that when we were neither able to satisfie the penalty of the Law, or to bring a conformity to it, Christ interposeth, and is become both redemption and righteousnesse for us.

Fifthly, *Hence in this Imputation of Christs righteousnesse unto us*, There are these things observable,

5. In the Imputation of Christs righteousnesse these things are observable.

1. Nothing in us wherefore God should account us righteous.

1. *That there is no foundation or cause within us of this Imputation*; when God doth account or reckon us as righteous, then he findes not any thing in us, neither is it because of any foundation we have laid, it is wholly from without us, even from Christ; and this should teach us in that great and noble priviledge of Justification, to fix our eyes and meditations more without us; What is the reason that every believer is not with the Church in the *Canticles* ravished with Christ, accounting him as the *chiefest of ten thousand*, alwayes languishing and breaking in desires after him? Even because we dwell in our selves, we rest in our selves, we would have a bottom, whereupon to stand and not be beholding to Christ only: When an earthly Judge shall justifie a man, he must have a foundation in the man, else he is an abomination to the Lord: but God, though he doth not justifie without a righteousnesse, yet the foundation thereof is not laid by our selves, but it is Christ that beareth up all.

2. *It is so farre, that there should be any foundation sought for in us, that there is the clean contrary.* When God justifieth he might justly condemn, if we regard what is to be found in us, which makes the Apostle call *Rom.* 4. the subject justified an ungodly man, *viz.* one that is not absolutely and perfectly righteous; Insomuch that we may justly stand

and admire the wisdome of God, who hath taken such a way to justifie us, as to keep us in a perpetual fear and trembling: for while looking into our selves, we see nothing but matter of death and condemnation, God at the same time giveth immortality and glory. This is the reason why the Scripture so often cals it *the grace of God*, because it is bestowed upon such who are unworthy, and that have nothing in themselves, but the desert of hell, and eternall vengeance.

3. *Hence it is that this Imputation hath a relative respect of Gods knowledge and will to us.* For seeing that Christ by compact and agreement with the Father, undertook our debt, and promised to expiate sin, and bring about an eternal righteousnesse, when Christ had fully discharged this undertaking, and nothing more was to be laid to our charge, then doth God the Father judge us, and account us to be righteous; and indeed herein lieth the infinite comfort and consolation of a Christian, that it is God himself who imputeth this righteousnesse, therefore what he accounteth to be must be, and shall stand, *It is God that justifieth*, and no condemnation can stand against his counsel.

4. *Though this Imputation be this relative in Gods purpose towards us, yet it is real, it hath a most sure and solid being.* For that is the daily cavilling of the Adversary, as if we made some *Ideal* and meer figment, an *Ens* that did neither subsist in God, or Christ, or in our selves. But though it be in Gods minde and will with a relative respect to us, yet it is real and substantial, it is not a meer notion or fancy: for, as you heard, the foundation of it is real, the obedience of Christ, and can there be a surer Rock then this? So the cause of it is real, Gods will and Covenant to accept of what Christ did, as if we our selves had done it. Its not then *fictio juris*, or a meer imagination, but there is a real paiment, and a full discharge, which is abundantly able to make us righteous; and although some Divines do divide Imputation into *real* and *rational*, making the Gospel-imputation to be a *rational* or *mental Imputation*, that is not to be understood, as if hereby they made it a meer fancy or fiction, only we are not really righte-

ous

ons to be justified in our selves, but its a translation, as it were of Christs righteousnesse to us, by Gods will and appointment. Let not the believer then, while he would reconcile his soul with this imputed righteousnesse, be afraid this is onely some pleasing dreame, or an humane fiction; but let him look upon it as that which stands upon a sure foundation, as the heavens and earth do. For what is it that keeps thee from falling into nothing but Gods Will and Power? And is not the same Will of God farre more interessed in this imputed righteousnesse? Fear not then that this beam will break under thy arms: All the believers that ever have or shall be, may lean on this, and not sink under them: Its real, sure and solid, though it be imputed, which doth also appear in the real and lively effects thereof, it brings peace, joy and everlasting consolation to such as partake of it; It makes them *glory in tribulations, and triumph over all adversities.*

5. Sixthly, *In this Imputation we are to consider the thing it self, the cause and the effect, for all these are accounted to us.* The thing it self is righteousnesse; what is more necessary then this to a sinner? For if you do respect God, he is holy and righteous, and loves onely righteousnesse: if you do regard the Law of God, that commands only righteousnesse, both in the root and branches; if heaven and glory, that is onely provided for righteous persons. Oh then! What can poor sinners do without righteousnesse? This then should rejoyce the humbled sinner, that in that very thing he is so much afraid and troubled, God hath provided a remedy. A righteousnesse thou dost want more then food, raiment, or any earthly comfort in the world, and therefore behold the marvellous kindnesse of God, who hath thus provided one for thee. 2. There is the cause of this righteousnesse, and that is Christs obedience, for its no contradiction, That Christs obedience should be both the meritorious cause of our Justification, and our material righteousnesse likewise, or that matter, which imputed to us, makes us righteous: God then looketh upon us, as if we had done and suffered all that Christ did; and although it seem very harsh to some, to say, That God looketh upon Christs fulfilling the Law, as if we

had fulfilled it, and as if we had done compleat obedience unto it, yet there is no just reason to be offended at this, no more then to say, That God looked upon us in Christ satisfying his justice, as if we had done it, or thus to say; Christ is our Surety, Christ is the second *Adam*. And then lastly, The effect of this righteousnesse is accounted to us, and that is, we have now a right to eternal life, we now have boldnes unto the throne of grace, we have liberty to come before God, there is nothing to be objected against us, we may not fear any arrests or accusations. Oh what tongue of men or Angels is able to expresse the happinesse of this man, who hath imputed righteousnesse! By this imputation they are what Christ their Surety is, God looks upon them as having Christs lovelinesse and perfumes upon them. This is true, and no *Antinomian* Positions can be inferred from hence.

7. Seventhly, *In this Imputation of righteousnesse, because it is necessarily conceived to make a relative change, it hath a terme* from which *and* to which; *or as some learned men expresse it, there are two manners of this Imputation, whereof the one is called Negative, the other Positive. The Negative Imputation, is the not imputing of sin, sin is not charged upon us. The Positive is an affirming or reckoning of righteousnes.* Thus some would make it the same motion, distinguished only from the several terms it relateth unto. But as we have shewed before, there is no inconvenience, yea a necessity to make remission of sin and imputation of righteousnesse two distinct things.

8. Eighthly, *If in the Imputation of righteousnesse there seem many things absurd to carnal reason, its not therefore to be rejected, as not being the truth of God.* The Doctrine of the Trinity, or the Resurrection of the dead, Is it not very incredible to flesh and bloud? Yea doth not the *Socinian* cry down an imputed Satisfaction with as much confidence as these can an imputed righteousnesse in the sense explained? And therefore the *Socinians* do equally reject both: Was it ever heard, say they, that another mans innocency or obedience should be accounted unto a man as his own? They will grant that in civil things, another mans money may be accounted as mine, but that another mans obedience should be judged

mine, this they abhor. But as the Lord Christ is called *Wonderful*, Isa. 9. so is every thing in him, and that comes from him, wonderful: his natures are wonderful, his offices, and the effects thereof are exceeding wonderful. Therefore, though the *Socinians* call it *absurdum, impium, intolerabile*, yea as that which doth contain a manner of our Salvation abhorring from the holy Scripture, and all humane sense, yet be not staggered at it, for the whole way of our redemption is carried on in a mysterious way. Indeed we are not to make mysteries and wonders, where the Scripture doth not assert them, but when it doth, there we are firmly to adhere to them.

Ninthly, *This Imputation of Christs merits and obedience,* 9.
is so necessary, that (except the Socinians) it is acknowledged by all 11
in one sense or other. Bellarmine and *Becanus* with the other Papists grant, There is in some sense an imputation of Christs righteousnesse to us, so do the *Arminians*, yea most of those who deny the active obedience of Christ imputed to us. But this certain sense they allow it in, doth not arise to the full dignity and worth that is to be attributed unto Christ in this particular; for it but a remote or virtual imputation, not a proximate and formal one. They explain themselves thus, That Christs merits are so made ours, that by them we receive grace and power to merit. Thus the Papist. Therefore they grant an application, communication and imputation of what Christ did unto us in this remote sense. So the *Arminians* with their consociates, They grant an union and communion with Christ, They grant what Christ did may be applied and imputed to us, but in this sense, that is, for our benefit, for our good; so that through his death either faith should be accounted of as a full righteousnesse, or else all righteousnesse be contained in remissium of sinne. But that his righteousnesse should be imputed to us, so as to be made ours, and that in his obedience we are to stand perfect before God: This is a Camel to them that they cannot swallow. But when the Apostle, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. as also *Rom.* 5. 19, *&c.* makes a comparison between *our sins laid on him*, and *his righteousnesse made ours*, as also a resemblance between the *first Adam* and the *second A-*

dom; this cannot but prove more then a remote or virtual imputation.

10. Tenthly, When we say, *Christs righteousnesse is imputed unto us*, *This is not so to be understood, as if we were made so formally ours, that thereby we could be said to be as righteous as Christ, and be infinitely perfect as he was*; Therefore learned writers do willingly abstain from the word *formal*, or to say, Christs righteousnesse is our formal righteousnesse; for although in some sense it may be made good, yet because the expression is obnoxious to much calumny, many do not willingly use it, but rather call this righteousnesse of Christ made ours, the material cause of our Justification: So that when we say, Christs righteousnesse is made ours, that is, *Its the matter whereby we stand justified in the sight of God.* And therefore

11. Eleventhly, *Christs righteousnes is not properly the form of our Justification, but Gods imputation of it.* For seeing that Justification is an act of God, it must be something without us that is the form of it, and that is both remission of sin and imputation of righteousnesse. Its true, many there are both on the right and left hand that rise up against this truth, but what strength they bring will be considered in their Objections.

Let us from these premisses with all thankfulnesse admire the grace of God, who hath not left us without a righteousnesse, and that a more noble and worthy one then ever we lost. It is much if our hearts do not alwayes burn like fire in the meditation of it: But it is because we are carnal, sold under sinne, not knowing how ill and dreadful our estate is: till therefore that good hour come, wherein God will make known unto us, that dunghill and hell which is within us, we can never esteem this imputed righteousnesse: Oh pray for that Spirit which shall convince of sinne and righteousnesse also!

SERM.

Serm. XXX.

The Doctrine of the Imputation of Righteousnesse demonstrated, With Answers to the Objections against it.

Rom. 4. 11.

That Righteousnesse might be Imputed to them also.

WE have laid down several Propositions to clear this Doctrine about imputed righteousnesse; Let us now consider what Arguments may be brought to establish it. And

First, This present Chapter will evidently confirm it, where Imputation of righteousnesse is so often mentioned; *The Scripture calls it several times an accounted or imputed righteousnesse: Now if it be an imputed righteousnesse, it must be either our own or anothers. It cannot be our own* for these Reasons. *Arg.* 1.

1. Because its a righteousnesse imputed without works; if then it were our own righteousnesse, it must be by works; but we are passive in our Justification, not active; we are not to look into our selves, but on Christ without us.

2. It cannot be our own righteousnesse imputed, because this is made to be of the like nature with remission of sinnes. Now its plain, That remission of sin is not any work of ours, but a gracious favour and act of Gods.

3. It

3. It cannot be our righteouſneſſe that is imputed, becauſe the ſubject who is here ſaid to be juſtified, is called an ungodly man, one that hath not ſuch a perfect and compleat righteouſneſſe that the Law requireth; if then a man hath it not of his own, it muſt be another's that is accounted to him.

4. It cannot be our righteouſneſſe that is imputed, for then it would be an imputation of debt, and not of grace. Thus the Apoſtle argueth *Rom.* 4. 4. *To him that worketh the reward is accounted of debt, not of grace.* For although to work be of grace in a ſanctified perſon, yet ſo farre it is of debt, as it is a work done by us. But the Apoſtle in this point doth attribute all to grace, giving it the *Alpha* and the *Omega*, the beginning and end of all. If therefore it be not ours that is imputed, whoſe can it be but Chriſts? and that it is Chriſts appeareth by *Chap.* 5. 19. *By one mans obedience ſhall many be made righteous*; and at the 24th verſe in this Chapter, *It ſhall be imputed to us alſo, if we believe on him that raiſed up Jeſus our Lord from the dead.* Thus this Chapter ſeemeth to give clear light in this Point. As for thoſe who would make the very work of beleeving the *credere*, to be the imputed righteouſneſſe; that hath been ſufficiently confuted already. Onely let us hear what may probably be replied. *Socinus* conſiders the word λογίζεσθαι, and ſaith, the word is either uſed *ſimpliciter* and abſolutely in it ſelf, or relatively; if ſimply in it ſelf, then it ſignifieth no more then to have an account or regard of a thing, as when God is ſaid not to impute ſinne, that is, not to take notice of it, not to put it in his account to puniſh it. And it is readily granted, that the Hebrew word doth ſometimes ſignifie thus, as *Pſal.* 8. 4. *What is man that thou art thus mindfull of him?* There is the ſame Hebrew word.

But in the next place, it may be underſtood relatively, where the Propoſition *in* or *ad* is underſtood, and then he ſaith it is not to be tranſlated *imputata*, but *reputata*. But this is a meer logomachy, for we take to repute and impute all one in this ſenſe, although indeed when it ſignifieth to repute or account ſtrictly taken, it is put abſolutely, as *Rom.* 6. 11.

Account

Account your ſelves dead to ſinne, 1 Cor. 4. 1. *Let a man account or judge of us, as the Miniſters of the Goſpel.* Sanderus the Jeſuite (*Lib. de Juſtif. pag.* 50.) refuſeth this tranſlation of the word, becauſe the Apoſtle when he would uſe a word to ſignifie *impute*, he uſeth a compound word, not a ſimple one, as *Philem. verſ.* 18. *If he have wronged thee, put that on mine account*, τοῦτο ἐμοὶ ἐλλόγει. Thus *Romans* 5. 13. ſinne οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται, is not imputed without the Law; but this obſervation is not univerſal, for the ſimple word is uſed, where imputation muſt neceſſarily be underſtood, as *Mark* 15. 28. *He was accounted amongſt tranſgreſſours*, What is that? But ſinne was imputed to him. *Rom.* 2. 16. *His uncircumciſion ſhall be accounted to Circumciſion.* There is the ſimple word λογίζεται.

But its further objected, *That though righteouſneſſe be ſaid to be imputed, yet not Chriſts righteouſneſſe*, Proferant vel unum locum, *&c. Let them bring but one place, ſay* Bellar. Socinus, *where Chriſts righteouſneſſe is ſaid to be imputed.* *Obj.*

To that we anſwer, That its neceſſarily implied, for righteouſneſſe is ſaid to be imputed, and that cannot be our own, as the context hath cleared; and beſides, *Its Chriſts obedience by which we are made righteous, yea we are made the righteouſneſſe of God in him.* And therefore it cannot be any other righteouſneſſe but that; and whereas its ſaid, it would be a kinde of blaſphemy to ſay, Chriſts righteouſneſſe is imputed to us for righteouſneſſe, as if that were not of it ſelf perfect and compleat, but needed a gracious imputation or acceptation: This ariſeth from a miſtake; for we ſay not, That Chriſts righteouſneſſe is imputed to be a righteouſneſſe, as if that of it ſelf were not ſo, onely there needed ſome gracious condeſcenſion on Gods part to accept of it for us. But we ſay, its imputed to us for righteouſneſſe, that whereas we needed a righteouſneſſe, and had none of our own; what Chriſt did, is as if we had done it in our own perſons. *Anſw.*

A ſecond *Argument* ſhall be drawn *from that notable collation the Apoſtle makes with Chriſt the ſecond Adam, and the firſt* 2.

Adam, Rom. 5. 12, 17, 18. where the Apostle doth thus argue, *That as all men are made sinners by Adams sinne, so all believers are made righteous by Christs obedience.* Now how is *Adams* sinne made ours? is it not by imputation? Indeed by his sinne we come also to have inherent corruption, and this is propagated to every one; and this is called *originale peccatum originatum*, but then *Adams* actual sinne is ours by imputation, and this is called *originale peccatum originans*, therefore at *vers.* 12. its said, *In whom we have sinned*, or if we translate it, *In as much as we have sinned*, it comes all to one; *Adams* sinne must needs be ours by imputation; for what reason can be given, why the sinnes of all Parents are not made their childrens, as well as *Adams* is made ours? but because of the Covenant made with *Adam*, and so all mankinde in him. Indeed *Bellarmine* bringeth this Argument against the Orthodox, and he frameth it thus, *As through Adam all are made sinners inherently through corruption dwelling in them; so through Christ all are made righteous inherently by an inward renovation of the minde.* Now all this may be granted, as part of truth, but the Apostles comparison is to be extended further; Neither doth he so much intend the sinne that is in us, as that we were guilty of in *Adams* disobedience: So that here we see the Apostle mentioning two common persons or representatives, and what they do is to be attributed to all that are contained in them. Thus as *Adams* imputed sin is the cause of all our inherent corruption; so Christs imputed righteousnesse is the fountain of all our inward happinesse.

3. Thirdly, *Christs righteousnesse is made ours, as our sinnes were made his, and that is only by imputation.* This Argument seemeth to be built on a Rock, even that Text 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult. He was made sinne for us, that we might become the righteousnesse of God in him; He was made sinne for us*; How is that but by imputation? *For he was reckoned amongst transgressours, and God laid upon him the iniquity of us all.* So that although in himself there was not found *any guile*, and he was the unspotted Lamb of God, yet as he was our Surety, and bore our sinnes, so our iniquities were imputed

ted to him, and he bore the wrath of God, because of them.

If it be said, That by sinne is meant a Sacrifice for sin, according to the usual phrase of the Scripture. *Object.*

It is answered, first, There is no necessity of taking it in that sense, yea the context seemeth to incline another way, for in the same verse is added, *He who knew no sinne, he became sinne*; Now sinne in the former place is taken properly, so that the expression would lose its grace; if in the later place it be not also taken properly. Again, *sinne* is opposed to *righteousnesse* in the Text, *he became sinne that we might become righteousnesse*; But *sinne* as it is *sinne*, not as a *Sacrifice* doth in its proper nature *oppose righteousnesse*; Neither doth it at all redound to Christs dishonour to expound it so, seeing the Prophet of old said, *God had laid our iniquities upon him*, which must necessarily be understood of *sinnes as sinnes*, and indeed the more Christ was humbled, debased, and this argued his greater love, and did the more exalt his Mediatorship. *Answ.*

In the second place, Grant that (sinne) be taken for the Sacrifice for sinne, yet still the Argument stands valid, *For he could not be made a Sacrifice for sinne, if sinne were not imputed to him.* When the Sacrifice of the Old Testament was offered, the laying on of hands upon it, did signifie the translation of the sinnes of the person offering, upon the beast to be sacrificed; and thus it was with Christ, who was typified by those Sacrifices, as the Apostle sheweth at large. Therefore though it be granted, that the sense of this place is, Christ was made a *Sacrifice for sinne*, yet this doth not exclude, but necessarily include, that our sinnes were imputed to him; and indeed, How could it come about, that Christ should be thus bruised and wounded, that he should die such an ignominious death? but because sinne was laid to his charge, *for death is the wages of sinne*; seeing therefore he had none of his own, they must be ours; not that therefore Christ was to be denominated a sinner, because he took them upon him, to bear them away.

Fourthly, *Christs righteousnesse is made ours, because in him* 4.

only we are accepted. Notably to this doth the Apostle speak, *Ephes.*1.6. *Wherein he hath made us accepted in his beloved,* ἐχαρίτωσεν; So that it is neither our persons, or our duties absolutely as so, can have any acceptance any further then God looketh upon them through Christ; He is the Altar that sanctifieth all, *Revel.*8.3. This is the Incense upon the golden Altar, which was to be added to the prayers of all the Saints. Its therefore very much derogatory to the glorious fulnesse of Christ, to think that he hath only merited and purchased grace for us, in which, and by which we are to stand justified. No, the very satisfaction and obedience of Christ, must be made ours; We must be looked upon, as if we had done it in our persons. A beleever and Christ is to be considered as one mystical person, when God looketh upon us and Christ, as two in this sense, then woe be unto us. All the grace and favour we have is in the beloved.

5. Fifthly, *The righteousnesse we have to be justified by, is often called the righteousnesse of God; Therefore that cannot be any other wayes in us, but by imputation.* Its often called the *righteousnesse of God,* Rom.1.17. Rom.10.3. 2 Cor.5.21. Phil. 3.6. Here we are to have the righteousnesse of God, and it is opposed to our own righteousnesse; yea we are said to be made this righteousnesse of God. Its true, in what sense it is called the righteousnesse of God, may be controverted, and it is agreed upon by all hands (except *Osiander*, who had few followers, and his opinion lasted but two years, though *Andreas Osiander* doth labour to excuse him, and saith, the Orthodox kept communion with him, as if his errours were more in his words, then in his minde) that it is not the essential righteousnesse of God, whereby he is just in himself. Neither is it the righteousnesse of God in a causal sense meerly, because God is the Authour of it, for our inherent righteousnesse is wrought by God, yet it cannot be called the righteousnesse of God in this sense, because its said to be revealed from him, and we are said to be *the righteousnesse of God in Christ*, therefore not in our selves: its alwayes opposed to the righteousnesse of the Law, which righteousnesse is of God in this sense, that he was the authour of it in *Adam*, and

and doth still begin it in beleevers, and will consummate it in heaven; therefore its called the righteousnesse of God, partly, because it is that, which he doth approve of, which can endure his sight; for whereas the Scripture saith, *In Gods sight no man can be justified*; implying thereby, that before man they may; Therefore this righteousnesse of God is such as may be brought before his severe Tribunal, such as God himself cannot refuse as imperfect and insufficient: But especially its called the righteousnesse of God, because it was the righteousnesse of him who was God as well as man; and therefore 1 *Cor.* 1. he is said *to be made of God righteousnesse, &c.* Neither can this Text be so slightly passed over, as some would; That as Christ is said to be *wisdome*, because he is the authour of it, so of righteousnesse, because he works inherent righteousnesse in us, for this is comprehended in that expression, when Christ is said to be made *sanctification to us*; Therefore righteousnesse is here taken for another thing then inward holinesse, and if so, it can be no otherwise then thus, Christ is made to us righteousnesse, because in and through him we are accounted righteous. Now this is so clear, that in the point of Satisfaction, all our adversaries (except *Socinians* agree) for these we are righteous as to the Law of God, not in our selves, for we were not able to discharge the penalty, but in another, who was Christ our Surety. The righteousnesse then of God is in the same sense used, as the bloud of God, *viz.* the righteousnesse of him who was God and man, and so becoming our full and compleat Mediatour, brought such a righteousnesse as was not in the world before: for *Adams* righteousnesse and the Angels righteousnesse, cannot be called the righteousnesse of God, as Christs is: if then it be the righteousnesse of God, it cannot be ours by infusion or acquisition.

6. Sixthly and lastly, *Our righteousnesse must be imputed by which we are justified, because that which is inherent in us, is imperfect, subject to much drosse and pollution, and therefore doth provoke and offend God, if strictly and severely examined.* It is true, we have an inward righteousnesse which may be called so truly and properly, yea in some sense perfect, but

never so perfect as to be the matter of our Justification, to be that which we may rest upon before God; if therefore our own inherent will not serve, an imputed one must be assigned.

But I shall no longer be on the affirmative part, because in the Discourse of Christs active obedience many of these things must be assumed. I shall therefore proceed to answer such Objections as are brought against imputed righteousnesse, and its good to take notice of this, That the *Socinians* they oppose all imputed righteousnesse, whether it be by Satisfaction or Obedience to the Law; so that this use we may make of it, That there is not scarce any one Argument brought by Authours against this imputed active obedience of Christ, but the same is urged against the imputed passive obedience of Christ; and when we come to that subject, shall give you the parallesme of the Arguments which are against imputed passive, and imputed active obedience.

Object. For the present, That which is from Scripture most opposed against this truth, is, those several places of Scripture (and they are almost innumerable, that I need not mention them) wherein beleevers are called *righteous*, and God is said *to approve of them, and to give them eternal glory in reference to their righteousnesse, all which looketh as if God did regard inherency and not imputation.*

Answ. But to such places as these are, there is a free and ready concession, That all justified persons are renewed, are made righteous, walk in the wayes of righteousnesse, give up themselves as servants to righteousnesse, and that God makes glorious promises both of this life, and the life to come to that godlines and righteousnes which they abound in: But what then? Is it therefore the matter for which they stand justified before God? Doth this righteousnesse answer the Law of God. Thus both Scripture and experience is against it. Consider *Job* excellently clearing this, *Job* 9.2,3. *How should man be just before God? If he will contend with him, he cannot answer him one of a thousand*; and truly for a man to think otherwise, or to beat up himself against God, is called Hardening,

dening, and ſuch an one ſhall not proſper: And *ver.* 15. *Though I were righteous* (*i. e.* though I know nothing by my ſelf) *yet I would not anſwer, but make ſupplication*, and the reaſon of this is laid down *v.* 20, 21.

For reaſons which they bring, they are like the Apples of *Sodom*, they have a ſpecious colour, but when touched are nothing but duſt. And truly it may be great grief of heart, that whereas formerly imputed righteouſneſſe was oppugned only by the profeſſed Adverſaries of the Reformed Churches; Now from our own ſelves ariſe men that with great frowardneſſe oppoſe it. What uncivil paſſion doth a late Writer ſhew againſt this Doctrine of imputed righteouſneſſe? calling it to him an *unintelligible notion, empty* and *truthleſſe words and fancies* (*Juſtification Juſtified, pag.* 20.) Surely its very uncharitable to make ſuch a number of learned men, pillars in the Church, in all their books to have written, empty and truthleſſe words, and to have delivered unintelligible fancies. But let us ſee where his ſtrength lieth. And

1. If the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt be made formally ours, then we are as perfect as Chriſt, need no more faith or repentance then Chriſt. To this effect alſo the great Papiſts, *Bellarmine* and others, eſpecially *Sanders*, is large upon this, that then we ſhould be made equal with Chriſt. But doth not the weakeſt and moſt diſtempered eye ſee the feebleneſſe of this conſequence? For the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt is not received by us, as if it were *ſubjectively inherent in us*, as if there were ſuch a communication of Chriſts righteouſneſſe to us, as the *Lutherans* ſay, There is of the divine Attributes to the humane nature, to make it infinite, omniſcient, *&c.* but it is imputed to us, ſo farre as we needed it. Its not made ours in the infinity of it, or the extenſion of it, but according to our neceſſity; ſo that we cannot be ſaid to be as righteous as Chriſt, as perfect as Chriſt, for we are but the Subjects *receiving of his fulneſſe*, he is the Agent that *communicates of this his fulneſſe to us*: Shall we ſay, the Stars are as glorious as the Sunne, and have as much light as the Sunne, becauſe every Starre ſhineth with a borrowed light

from

from the Sunne? But because the *Antinomian* doth affirm this as a truth naturally deducted from the Doctrine of imputed righteousnesse; and because the Adversaries also fasten this upon the Orthodox, as an unavoidable consequence, I shall answer it more largely when we come to assert Christs active obedience imputed to us.

Object. 2. Its objected, *If Christs righteousnesse be formally made ours, this would make Gods judgement to be otherwise then according to truth. For* (say they) *by imputed righteousnesse we should be pronounced just, and accounted as righteous, when yet we are in our selves imperfect; and that God should at the same time look upon us, and account us to be both perfect and imperfect, is that which is exceedingly wondered at.*

Answ. But (not to say any thing of being made formally righteous by Christs righteousnesse, which is acknowledged an expression subject to misconstruction) will not this overthrow the Doctrine of Christs Satisfaction also? For how can we at the same time be looked upon by God, as having the debt paid in our Surety, and yet in our selves guilty? How at the same time doth God blot out our sinnes, and yet sin remaineth in us?

2. If it be impossible to be accounted imperfect in Sanctification, and yet perfect in Justification, then one of these absurdities must necessarily be maintained, either that our Justification is imperfect, and if so, then we can have but imperfect peace and joy, seeing our pardon and righteousnesse is imperfect, or else our sanctification is perfect, which yet is expresly denied by that Author of the Sermon, *pag.* 17. Its therefore necessary that God should look upon our sanctification as imperfect, though our Justification be perfect.

3. Gods judgement is according to righteousnesse and truth, we be pronounced righteous in Christ, though sinners in our selves, for there is a righteousnesse whereby we are made righteous, and this righteousnesse is by God made ours, we being in the number of those whom Christ undertook to be made a Surety for. So that we are not to account this Imputation a matter hard thought on God without any founda-

tion

tion of truth, for as truly and as really as Christ died, and rose again; so really are the benefits which a believer partaketh of by him. Therefore imputation is grounded upon the sure performance of that which Christ undertook for us, and if a *tittle of the Law shall not fall to the ground*, much lesse shall any of those benefits he hath purchased. Now there cannot be imagined any way how Christs benefits should be derived to us, but by imputation.

3. *Castellio* objects, *That this imputed righteousnesse, or the Doctrine of it is very pleasing to flesh and blood; Every one will in a carnal manner be glad of this, for hereby we shall not be troubled about our own righteousnes, we will not much master how or what we do, because Christ hath done all for us. But this is as the Papists object against justifying faith*, they say, *This Doctrine is a ground of all carnal security and presumption, let a man live as he list its but believing, and then he shall be saved.* *Object.*

Now to all this we answer truly, That the way of faith and imputed righteousnesse is most contrary to flesh and blood, we see *Rom.* 10, 3. That the Jews *would not submit to the righteousnesse of God, but went about to establish their own righteousnesse*, and they spake the natural inclination of all, who said, *What shall we do that we might be saved?* It was long ere *Paul* could renounce all the things that were gain to him, and prize the righteousnesse of Christ onely. Its not then a doctrine pleasing to flesh and blood, but altogether contrary, for it driveth a man into a self-judging, a self-abhorrency, a self-renunciation, and makes Christ to be all in all. By Pharisaical and Popish doctrines we see, that its more pleasing to flesh and blood to set upon some extraordinary works, and to make them the matter of our righteousnesse before God. What else is considerable in this Doctrine of imputed righteousnesse, will be more largely handled hereafter. *Answ.*

Serm. XXXI.

Of the Sufferings of Christ, both in body and soul, as imputed to us for our Righteousnes.

Isa. 53. 5.

But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.

THis Evangelical Prophet doth in this Chapter not so much foretell a Propheſie, as punctually deſcribe an hiſtory of Chriſts ſufferings. As for the *Jews* interpretation of this concerning the people of *Iſrael*, or *Grotius* his application of it to *Jeremiah*, though more ſublimely, to Chriſt, they are with neglect to be paſſed by: for *Mat.* 8. 1 *Pet.* 2. *Act.* 8. 32. do evidently demonſtrate this Chapter to be wholly a clear Propheſie or rather Hiſtory of Chriſt; in ſo much that our Prophet is like the morning ſtarre diſpelling the dark ſhadows of *Moſes*, and ſhewing Chriſt, the riſing Sun.

In the words you may conſider, 1. *The correllive* or *adverſative particle, But*: this is ſpoken in oppoſition to thoſe thoughts which the *Jews* had concerning Chriſt, for they judged him to be ſo ſmitten of God, and put to death in that extraordinary ſhamefull manner, becauſe God hated him, as if he had been ſome egregious impoſtor, and tranſcendent wicked man: Now ſaith the Prophet, But it was not ſo, what-

whatsoever men thought, *he was thus wounded for our sinnes and iniquities.* So that in the words we may consider what is derived from us to Christ, and from Christ to us, or the *malum oblatum* and the *bonum collatum.* In the evil removed, we may consider the *person* suffering, the *manner* how, and the *impulsive cause*: The *person* is Christ, as abundantly appears by the foresaid allegations, who was God and man, and so onely could procure our redemption for us. The *manner* of suffering is expressed in those words, *he was wounded*, and *he was bruised.* This signifieth his death to be most sharp and bitter, wherein all his bones were as it were to be contunded into dust. 2. *The impulsive cause* is said to be for our transgressions. The Hebrew word signifieth the proud and rebellious transgressions of Gods commands: and for our iniquities, that signifieth all sinne, any thing that is a perverse declination from the right way. Its not worth the while to confute the *Socinian* cavil, that would not have the preposition *Min*, to signifie a cause, but a remote occasion. In the good bestowed or procured, there we may consider, the *mercy or benefit it self*, our peace; that is either generally all good and happiness, as commonly the word signifieth, or particularly peace with God, and in our own conscience. 2. The *cause of this*, the chastisement was upon him: The word signifieth correction or discipline, it comes from a word that signifieth to learn, but because the dull scholar needeth correction, therefore its applied to chastisements; and here in reference to Christ, it signifieth all that misery and calamity he underwent for our sakes. It followeth, *with his stripes we are healed*: This is to be understood spiritually, in respect of our guilt, so that the very reading of this text should kindle the fire of love in our hearts to Christ, for how dear did it cost him to bring about peace for us; our sinnes wounded him, our sinnes buffeted him, our sinnes crucified him: That as Naturalists speak of a bird, which applied to a man sick of the Jaundies, takes the disease to her self, and becomes all over that colour, and so dieth to heal the man; Thus in some respect, Christ took our sinnes upon him, he was crucified and died as a sinner, when yet no guile was found in his mouth.

Thus we have a wonderfull exchange, God became man, wisedom was made folly, righteousnes was made sinne, and life became death. Having therefore shewed that *the righteousnes we stand justified by before God, is an imputed righteousnes and that of Christs*, let us first consider the *satisfactory righteousnes which is made ours*, and this is very clearly and emphatically described all along the Chapter, so that we may call it a spiritual crucifix wherein the Lord Christ is evidently set forth crucified before our eies.

Doct. That the sufferings of Christ are imputed to us for our righteousnes.

That the sufferings of Christ are imputed to us for our righteousnes. This is genuinely deduced from the text, for *our iniquities are laid upon him, he was bruised for our iniquities*, and we were *healed* and reconciled to God by this means. The sufferings of Christ as satisfying Gods justice for our sinnes, are our legal righteousnes, its as if we our selves in our own person had made a compensation.

To open this, let us take notice of all the other emphaticall expressions that are used by the Prophet in this Chapter, for we are not only speculatively but affectionately and practically to meditate on them; and the Prophet doth so often mention it, as if he in the Old Testament, like *Paul* in the New, desired to know nothing but Christ crucified. At *v.6.* we have a notable phrase, *The Lord hath made the iniquity of us all to meet on him*; where you see, 1. its Gods act, that all our sinnes should be laid on him, here is nothing done against Gods will. 2. Its the iniquity of us all, all the sinnes of the elect people of God, let them be great sinnes or small, there is not one but it is laid on Christ, And then 3. They are made to meet on him; the word is taken from many streams of water, that violently meet in one place, and so will bear down every thing before them; thus all our sinnes in the guilt of them, were made to meet on Christ, that had he been meer man, they would have overwhelmed him over and over again, but being God as well as man, he could with *Sampson* rise up and break these cords. Thus you see the sharpest stings that all our sinnes could put forth, were run into him, but by this he overcame sinne. At the fourth verse, there is likewise a pregnant expression, *Surely*

he

he hath born our griefs and carried our ſorrows. By griefs and ſorrows are meant ſinne with all the conſequents of it, and the two Hebrew words *Naſa* and eſpecially *Sabal* ſignifie to lift up a thing, to bear, to indure and carry a thing upon the ſhoulder as Porters do, and by conſequent to take it quite away. This place is alledged, *Mat.* 8. 15. and 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. but the application of it by the Evangeliſt *Matthew*, to the healing of diſeaſes hath cauſed a twofold difficulty; 1. As if the Prophet ſpake only of bodily diſeaſes and infirmities. 2. As if the bearing of them was not by imputation, for our diſeaſes were not imputed to him, but only by removing and taking away; but ſeeing the Apoſtle *Peter* doth apply it to ſinnes, and the Evangeliſt to bodily diſeaſes, we may ſay, that the Prophet ſpeaks principally and moſt directly of ſinne, but ſecondarily and leſs principally of bodily diſeaſes, becauſe they are the effect and fruit of ſinne, ſo that we may ſay in ſome ſenſe, He took all our bodily infirmities upon him, becauſe he took our ſinnes upon him; and howſoever the Learned obſerve that the Hebrew word *Naſa* may ſignifie the ablation of a thing, which yet is not derived or imputed to him, as God himſelf is ſaid to take away ſinne, *Exod.* 34. 7. yet no place can be or is brought, no not by the Socinians, though ſo diligent to ſearch in this matter, where *Sabal* doth ſignifie to take away, but alwaies is uſed to bear and to carry. So that this later word doth neceſſarily imply a derivation and imputation of our ſinnes upon him; they lay as an heavy burden upon him: *Heb.* 1. 3. Chriſt is ſaid *to bear up*, or uphold all things, but that is done eaſily by his power, there is no difficulty in it; only to bear ſinne, that was ſo great a weight and burden, that with great agonies and conflicts, he labours with it; he bore that burden which ſinketh all the devils and damned men into hell. No leſs conſiderable is *verſ.* 10. *It pleaſed the Lord to bruiſe him, he hath put him to grief:* This relates not only to death, but to all thoſe anxieties and troubles which he indured in his ſoul: and it is obſervable, how the Scripture doth not referre this meerly to Gods permiſſion, as if he ſuffered wicked men to procure his death, but here is an higher deſign and purpoſe of God;

therefore in the Hebrew it's *Chaphits*, which signifieth Gods good pleasure, his *eudokia*, wherein he taketh great delight: so that whereas we might be offended to think that Gods Sonne, innocent and free from all iniquity, should be subjected to so much misery and violence, this may satisfie us, that it was the just and righteous will of God, wherein his good pleasure did shew it self, for hereby he would create for himself the greatest glory that could be: further more, whereas this death of Christ might be accounted only a glorious Martyrdom or a transcendent example of patience, as the Socinians cavil; We have the nature of his death described in the word *Asham*, which word in its first and proper signification doth denote to sinne and offend, and by a *Metonymy* is used for a sacrifice, whereby the sinne of the offendor is expiated, as *piaculum* among the Latins: So that we are to look on Christs death, as that which is propitiatory, and expiatory of all the guilt which belongs to us. We may not pass by *ver.* 11. where the work of our redemption is called *the travell of his soul*, which cannot but denote the great misery and affliction he indured to purchase our peace. It was said to the woman, that *in sorrow she should bring forth*, and thus it was also in Christ, it behoved him in great grief and trouble both of soul and body, to bring forth this glorious salvation, which is to be bestowed on those that are his; and whereas it is said, that *by the knowledge, i.e.* by the faith of Christ *many shall be justified*, observe the reason given, *for he shall bear their iniquities*. This makes it plain that we are justified or constituted and pronounced righteous, because Christ did bear our sinnes. The last verse is considerable, where the willingness and readiness of Christ is described, *He hath poured out his soul unto death*. This denoteth how freely and gladly he offered up himself, though the bruising and wounding was so great, though his calamities were thus inexpressible, yet he poureth out his soul. Oh what a shame and trembling should this be to us, who finde our hearts so dead and dull, so listless many times to that which is our duty; Shall Christ pour out his soul to death, and shall not thou pour it out to prayer and to love Christ? Yea this death

is

is called *v.g.* deaths in the plural number, to aggravate it, as if it were many deaths he died, even as many as there are elect people, who without this redeemer were to die in their own person. The summe of these glorious and full texts concerning Christs sufferings ariseth to these particulars.

Conclusions from the foregoing Scriptures.

1. *That Christ suffered in a most painfull and grievous manner.* The Schoolmen determine that Christ indured more grief, then all the sorrows of all the men in the world put together: this is certain the Scripture by these several expressions doth evidence, that his pain and sorrow was unspeakable: and if we reade the Evangelists describing what affections were upon him both before and at his sufferings, we shall readily yield they were no less, then what were foretold. 1.

2. *That these sorrows and afflictions were in his soul as well as in his body:* For its impossible that the body of a man should be pained and afflicted, but the soul must also be sensible of it, because of the near conjunction of soul and body. Therefore in all sorrow and grief, the soul is the principal, the body instrumental; that as the soul seeth by the eye, heareth by the ear, so it is grieved and pained by the body, as *Tertullian* well, *In carne, & cum carne, & per carnem agitur ab animâ, quod agitur in corde.* Christ then could not suffer in his body, but he must necessarily suffer in his soul. 2.

3. *This suffering in his soul, was not only that which arose from conjunction with his body, but also more immediatly from the apprehension of Gods displeasure for our sinnes, in whose room he stood.* This indeed is denied, and so a great part of Christs passive righteousnes imputed to us is destroyed; but as is to be shewed, Christ died not a meer simple death, as Martyrs, or as ordinary men, but as a surety, as a curse for us, and as satisfying the justice of God, and therefore there were immediate sufferings in his soul, though without sinne: hence we reade of those great agonies and troubles that were in his minde, before he had pain in his body any way. 3.

4. *Hence Christs death is to be looked upon as a peculiar extraordinary thing;* that as there is no person ever was like him, 4.

him, *God and man*, so no death like his, being an atonement to God, to satisfie his justice, to reconcile God. This satisfactory efficacy in Christs death, we have at large shewed already.

5. Therefore in the fifth place, *It is from this compensatory virtue in Christs death, that he is made our righteousnes.* That whereas God was offended, death was deserved; and we wholly impossible to pacifie God, he became our Mediator and surety, making this blessed and happy exchange that our sinnes should be laid on him, and his righteousnes communicated to us: and in this sense all Papists will yield, that Christs righteousnes is imputed unto us, that is, that Christ by his death satisfied the justice of God, and so what he did was as if we had done it, he paid the debt, and so by this means we are made righteous. Neither may it stumble us, that Christ is but once called a Surety, *Heb.* 7. 22. when yet we lay the whole foundation of this exchange upon that, for once is enough; and besides, there are other expressions which are equivalent to it. Now to this satisfactory righteousnes of Christ, by way of imputation, there are two arguments brought, which were not treated of before, at least the first.

Object. The first is this, *It stands not*, say they, *with the truth and holiness of God, that an innocent man should suffer for the nocent. How can we think*, say they, *that Christ should be thus bruised and wounded for us sinners and wicked men, whenas he was altogether pure, and unspotted? Doth not God himself say, The soul that sinneth, that shall die.*

Answ. But in the first place, seeing that it must needs be acknowledged that Christ died such a shamefull and painfull death as he did, and further that he was innocent, so that no guile was found in his mouth; yea *Pilate* his judge acquitted him: it must therefore follow that an innocent man was put to death; he that died had no cause of death, no not in any way: So that Christs sufferings were not like *Jobs*, whom God did by his soveraign power afflict by way of trial, for though this was not done for any particular sinne of *Jobs*, yet he was not without sinne: Though *Job* was not thus chastised *propter peccatum*, yet it was not *sine peccato*: But in Christ

all

all his sufferings were, if we respect his own person, causeless, he had no sinne for which any of those calamities could be brought upon him, therefore it must be for our sinnes: and hence the Socinians themselves are forced to acknowledge, that though Christ did not suffer for our sinnes as the impulsive or meritorious cause, yet he did for them as the occasion, because by his death he left us an example, and withall received power to do away our sinnes, if no more be granted but this, it will necessarily follow that an innocent person did suffer for a nocent.

2. *It is so farre from being repugnant to Gods goodness, that the Scripture aggravateth this consideration, that whereas he himself was without sinne, yet he would undertake the punishment of sinners,* 1 Pet. 2. 21. 1 Pet. 3. 18. *Christ once suffered for sinners, the just for the unjust:* and 1 *Cor.* 5. 21. *He who knew no sinne, became sinne for us:* So that if Christ had not been innocent, it would have been wholly impossible for him to have wrought our redemption, and herein the Scripture preferreth Christ before the legal high Priest, that he was to offer *for his own sinnes*, as well as of the people; but Christ was unspotted and altogether holy.

3. That which may wholly satisfie this objection, is, *That it is no injustice or cruelty for an innocent person to suffer for a nocent, as Christ did, provided there be these conditions:* 1. That the person suffering be of the same nature and kinde with those for whom he suffers, for seeing that it was man whom God had threatned, its necessary it should be one of mankinde that must suffer: Not an Angel, if it had been possible for him to be our Mediatour. 2. Its no injustice, if the innocent person be *willing*, if this be not laid upon him contrary to his desire; but we see in Christ an earnest readiness of heart to undertake all our grief, he desireth it as the greatest good that could befall him: Hence its said, *He poured out his soul an offering for sinne*; so that as sometimes the Scripture speaks of God designing and appointing him thereunto, so at other times it saith, *He gave himself a ransom for our sinnes*: and *Behold I come to do thy will O God*, yea he was streightened till he did it. Thus you see this was not against his will,

yet it was that which he greatly desired.

4. *It is no cruelty, if the innocent party be able to bear and indure all that sorrow which shall be laid upon him.* Indeed to lay an heavy load upon such weak shoulders as will break under the burden, is unmercifulness: but Christ was able to go through all. Though he was in agonies, yet he cried *My God*; and though he was dead and buried, yet even from thence by his own power he could raise himself.

Lastly, *It is no injustice, if by the sufferings of an innocent person there can be wrought a greater good, and more glory to God, then his meer suffering is an evil.* But thus it is here, by Christs dying for the ungodly, the greatest glory and honour is brought to God, that ever was or can be; insomuch that God himself could not demonstrate a greater effect of his love, nor could there be a more open way to advance his glory. Therefore in some sense we may say, the affliction and death it self was justly laid upon Christ, not in respect of men, for they did it wickedly, and maliciously, so that there was no humane reason or law to put him to death; but if we do regard Gods will, and the Covenant made between the Father and the Son, then it was just, that if Christ would be a Surety for sinners, and satisfie what Gods justice and the Law did require, that he must die such a death as was threatened to sinne.

Object. 2. The second Argument hath greater difficulty in it, and many other inferiour difficulties are contained in it: *If Christs sufferings by way of satisfaction be our imputed righteousness, then he must suffer all that we were deomed unto*; for by what reason he was bound to die, which was one part of the curse threatned, by the same reason he was bound to suffer all the other parts of the curse denounced: Now the other parts were chiefly *a spiritual and an eternal death, which seemeth not applicable to Christ without blasphemy*: so that its very difficult to decide what sufferings they are which Christ satisfied God with, and are made our righteousness. As for the Socinians they take away the foundation of the question, so that we are not to ingage with them: But even amongst those that hold Christs satisfaction by his sufferings, there

are

are different opinions. That which is weakest and most absurd of all is, of those that hold *his sufferings only spiritual*; that what he endured as our Surety for us, it was only affliction and trouble in his soul: but this doth so directly confront Scripture, that it may be wondered how any can have such a thought, seeing every where almost his death is instanced in as a ransom and sacrifice for our sinnes. Neither is the argument of any validity which they bring, *That if Christ satisfied by his death, then we could not die, or if we did die, then we should be partners with him in his work of redemption.* But this may be retorted on themselves, who hold Christs satisfaction only in his soul: *for, do not many of the children of God feel the terrours of God upon their souls?* do not they often conflict with Gods anger, though Christ felt these upon his soul? and are the godly when they feel this, copartners with Christ in the work of our redemption? The godly therefore though they die, yet it is not to the same end and purpose which Christ did, for they die not to satisfie Gods wrath, or to appease his justice, but their death is made a blessing unto them, and a sure passage to eternal Life.

Therefore dismissing these, there are a numerous part rise up, that hold *Christs suffering by way of satisfaction was onely in his soul.* Indeed they will grant Christ suffered in his soul, by *Sympathy* or conjunction from the body, for its impossible if a man be living and sensible, but that when the body suffers, the soul also should suffer therewith. But this they peremptorily deny, that Christ suffered in his soul relatively to our sinne, as if he apprehended the wrath of God due to our iniquities, so as to tremble and to be in those grievous agonies because of such an apprehension. The Papists they generally go this way, limiting his sufferings to his body. In former times amongst the Orthodox this was controverted amongst themselves, as appeareth by Bishop *Bilsons* book on this subject, who is also industriously for the negative, that Christ suffered not in his soul in the sense specified; And now very lately this opinion is revived, that Christs body offered on the Cross was the satisfactory oblation, and that he suffered not in his soul in the mentioned sense. There is a book

whose scope is to assert this, and overthrow the contrary, [*Pinchin* of the meritorious price of mans Redemption, and a Sermon lately printed to justifie that opinion.] But it may be made good by Scripture, *That the sufferings of Christ, wherein satisfaction to Gods justice doth consist, and which are our righteousnesse, are both of soul and body*: So that Christ while he made an atonement for our sins, was not only bruised and crucified in his body, but in his soul also was without the sense of that joy and comfort, which otherwise he had, and that because of our sinnes laid on him, though all this was without the least sin in him.

SERM. XXXII.

Sheweth, By Propositions and Arguments, That the whole Manhood of Christ suffered in Body and Soul, because of the Anger of God due to Sinners.

ISA. 53. 5.

But he was wounded for our iniquities, &c.

OUr work is to answer that great and weighty Objection concerning the manner of Christs sufferings: *For if Christs sufferings were a legal righteousnesse, and he was bound to undergo the punishment that was due to us, then* (saith the Opponent) *he must suffer the pains of the damned, then he must*

have

have been guilty of despair and blasphemy, as the damned are.

We have declared the different opinions of learned Authours in this matter; That which was concluded on as the truth, was, That the whole manhood of Christ suffered in body and soul, and in his soul not meerly by conjunction or sympathy with his body, or because of a naturall death meerly, but chiefly because of the anger of God due to sinners, whose person he sustained. And before I bring the Arguments for to prove this, I shall lay down several Propositions to state the Question, and to clear the truth, by which all contrary Objections may be answered: So that I shall not in a formal manner mention them, because I intend not to belong on this point.

First, *Concerning the sufferings of Christ, men have been very prone to runne into several errours.* The *Arians* of old they argued against the Deity of Christ, because he thus suffered, *How could God* (say they) *be sorrowfull and grieved? How could Christ be God, and yet complain God had forsaken him?* Some of the Ancients answering this Argument, and thinking it indecent and unseemly for Christ to be thus troubled, did say, *That Christ did not suffer these things in reference to himself, but for us; he did not grieve for himself, but for us*, as if these affections in Christ were not so much in his own person, as our person; but this is to overthrow the letter of the Scripture; for as he was indeed man, so he was indeed sorrowfull and grieved: As he was really crucified, so was he also in Agonies, crying out, *My God, Why hast thou forsaken me?* Thus these give too little. Others they have gone too farre, making the very Divine Nature it self to suffer, but that is impossible. *Bellarmine* and *Maldonat* cry out, *That we should stop our ears against the blasphemy of Calvinists in this particular, who say, Christ suffered the pains of the damned in his soul, and that this was his descending into hell.* But if *Maldonat* had remembred his own Rule, when he expounded those words of Christ [*My God, Why hast thou forsaken me?*] he would not have been so censorious. [*Com. in Matt. 26.*] He alledgeth very hard speeches of some of the Fathers, which if rigidly examined would be intollera-

1.

ble doctrine, and yet he can say, *Bruce Answer to Gregor. in vita Bruchi.* But for *Calvin*; he doth not only excuse, but iustifie his words. For whereas *Calvin* is brought to say, That Christ despaired; this is a calumny, for that is by plain in the way of relation, it is not *Calvins* assertion; and besides, [*Howard. Evangel. in regno Papatus.*] *Calvin* saith, *desperationem* is not *desperatio*, he doth not say, Christ despaired, yea in his whole drift in that place to free Christ from the least sinfull perturbation, though he saith, they are too frigid and cold that expound Christs sufferings of his body only. This, he saith, is to make Christ a sufferer of the body only, and not of the soul. It is true, there are some expressions in *Calvin* that happily may be incommodious, and obnoxious to cavil, as when he saith, that prayer of Christ [*If it be possible let this Cup passe away*] was not *medicata*, and did not passe from him, *ubique*, which he corrected; for though these are well excused by the Orthodox, yet malicious enemies think they have thereby cause to triumph. But no man that reads *Calvin* can acknowledge any other but an admirable dexterity in interpreting of Scripture, which made *Scaliger* himself call him, *Sanctissimus Scripturæ interpres*; and truly in his Exposition of those Texts which describe Christs sufferings, he doth excellently shew, That those great fears and troubles which Christ felt, must needs be more then from the apprehension of meer death, even a conflict with the anger of God, and the effects thereof. Therefore though he saith, Christ did *fulcire omnibus desperationibus*, yet for all this he overcame all those temptations. As for the opinion of those who say, Christ suffered the pains of the damned; and if Bishop *Bilson* Refuter said, That Christ suffered as much torment in his soul as any reprobate could, These passages are again corrected by those Authors, For they say, That they acknowledge Christ was alwaies while free from sin, and that there was the least blemish in his pure and unspotted soul. But to avoid all calumnies, its best to keep our selves to the Scripture.

Onely in the second place, Take notice of this, That the

he

be honoured and glorified. Any kinde of debasement that the Scripture giveth to Christ, and that in generall words, we are to expound as largely as they signifie, so that we do not attribute sin to him. As when the Prophet saith, *He was wounded for our iniquities*, we are to interpret this of his soul as well as his body: for seeing the Scripture speaketh it generally, we are so to expound it. Therefore seeing the scope of the Scripture is to amplifie and aggravate the sorrows of Christ, we are to enlarge them as farre as may be, so that thereby we involve him in no sin. Therefore that fear of some, to say, Christ was truly troubled, that he was indeed in such agonies, and so of others, that will admit of no agonies and anguish in the soul, with Gods wrath for our sinne, in a disadvantagious manner of Christ, while they think to honour him, for so we should be dishonour to him, he was not crucified, &c. Though he was not grievously tempted in his soul, though without sin. *Ambrose* spake better, *Dubitemus ergo humanæ animæ quæ eorum sint propria.* And again, *Non erubescat fides, quod Christus infirmi corporis susceperit passionem.*

Thirdly, *In this Doctrine of Christs suffering wrath from God for our sinne, we are not to measure Christs sufferings with our selves, who cannot have any strugglings and agonies upon us without some sinne adhering.* Grant that Christ did vehemently fear death, yet no man could fear it so, but that some imperfection or irregularity would cleave to it. Now in all these troubles Christ felt in his soul, there was a new-old difference to be made between him and mere man. For

What soever fears and agonies we in Christ thought wrung out by the power of sin, he had a command over them, both in respect of their rise, their progresse and duration; so that it was not with him as with us, who are carried to grieve and be troubled whether we will or no, by those passions that move us, [illegible] its said Christ [illegible] but in the Originall [illegible] All the afflictions and grief of soul [illegible] which were upon him

3.

4.

him were voluntary, he had a power to command these winds and waves to be still when he pleased. Even as he had power over his life to lay it down, and take it up, so of his grief and temptations, so that because they were under his voluntary government and disposing, there could be no sinne in them. *Augustine* saith well, He took these troubles not *conditionis necessitate*, but *miserationis voluntate*, not by any condition necessitating him thereunto, but a willing and merciful condescension.

3. Another difference is in respect of the original from whence these affections flow, for they came from Christs pure, holy and undefiled nature: So that whatsoever commotion and troubles might be in Christs soul, yet they were always holy, for from such a pure fountain could come no other but pure streams: Even as water in a pure glasse though ye shake it never so much, yet it is pure and clear. But now man being originally corrupted, and so having some mud and filth in the bottome of his soul, he is never shaken and moved, but some impurity and defilement will rise up; Do not then judge of Christ according to what we finde in our selves? Certainly we could not endure such agonies, we could not have said, *My God, why hast thou forsaken me?* But there would have been some gradual diffidence, some sinful impatience.

4 Fourthly, *That which was the greatest and most eminent in Christs soul, while he suffered, was not the fear of death, but a want of that joy and comfort, or the sense and feeling of Gods favour and help.* This was the sting in his sufferings, as we shall prove anon. I am now onely to explain it, because the Adversaries will not understand the sense of the Orthodox, but take up the words of hell, and the torments of the damned, and a second death, as if hereby all blasphemy were uttered against Christ; but we say, That Christs sufferings, and those extream agonies in his soul did arise from a greater cause then meer death, it was because of our sinnes laid upon him; and so as in our stead did undergo our punishment so farre as it implied no sinne, and this was for a season to be destitute of all inward comfort; so that these comfortable

forrable apprehensions of Gods favour and protection, which the Divine Nature did for a while deny, that so in his humane Nature he might go through the work of our Redemption. To open this, you must know, That though Christ was God and man, yet the Divine Nature did not alwayes put forth such glorious and resplendent effects, as it could do, but did as it pleased cohibit and restrain them, otherwise Christ could not have been in a state of humiliation and suffering for us; We reade *Matth.*17.2. *That Christ was transfigured, his face did shine as the Sunne, and his raiment was white as light.* What was this but the Divine Nature communicating and diffusing such glory to the manhood? and had it not been for that œconomy or dispensation, that Christ must be in a despised, servile and ignominious condition, he would have been alwayes in such glory. Therefore that was not a miracle, for Christ to be so transfigured, his humiliation and debasement was a miracle, for thereby was suspended that glory and lustre, which according to the natural course, would have been derived from the Godhead to his humane Nature. Therefore its no more contradiction for Christ at the same time to have faith in God, and yet to want the sense of comfort, then to know God was his Father that would support him, and deliver him, yet to be in such extream fears and agonies, as they confesse he was in, because of his death: So that by what means they can reconcile these two together, so can we his faith in God, and yet want of the sense of Gods favour in these temptations; And whereas it might be said, That the want of Gods favour is a sinne; that is wholly denied, for the meer want of the sense of Gods love is not intrinsecally a sinne: Even in the people of God, meer and simple absence, or want of the favour of God, by some desertions which they are in, meerly for trial and exploration, is not a sinne. Indeed a godly man can very difficultly be in a spiritual temptation, complaining God hath left him, but there is sinne accompanying such a complaint, because we for the most part procure such spiritual desertions by our own fault, and being weak in faith do many times offend against the promises of God, but it

was not thus in Christ. Its true, as every thing almost in Christ was a miracle, that he was God and man, that he should be born in such an extraordinary manner, so likewise that he should suffer in such a transcendent way. This Sunne of righteousnesse suffered an Eclipse by the interposition of our sins, and though he was sensible of, and strugled with the anger of God due to us, in whose stead he appeared, yet in all this he was not overcome, or did he give place to any temptation for a moment.

5. Fifthly, *Though this spiritual dereliction be not to be limited to an external forsaking and leaving of him into the hand of the Jews, yet we are not to enlarge it unto every kinde of forsaking, as if Christ were forsaken of God in every respect, as the damned in hell are, but only so farre that way might be given for Christ in soul and body, to accomplish our redemption by his sufferings.* For as Christ would not call for a Legion of Angels externally to protect him in his necessity; so neither would he have at that time those inward joyes and comfortable apprehensions, that so he might drink of that bitter cup which was prepared for him, because of our sins: Christ could not have been in those natural fears and afflictions, had not the Divine Nature given place; So neither in this spiritual defection; *But this desertion was not universal, and in every respect.* For

1. There was not a dissolution of the hypostatical Union, no not in death it self; for although the soul was separated from the body, yet the Divinity all that while was neither divided from soul or body, he did not then cease to be God, though in such an abysse of grief. Nor

2. Was it a dereliction in respect of graces, as if God did so leave his humane Nature, that it was deprived thereby of faith and hope, or love of God: how low so ever he was debased, yet still the Scripture saith, his temptations were without sinne in him; and this all those Divines do acknowledge, that yet use these expressions, That his soul suffered death, and that he endured the pains of the damned: he was not then forsaken of God in respect of any gracious qualification.

3. It

3. It was not a total desertion in respect of every part; for although Christ in respect of his sense and feeling, cryed out of this forsaking, yet in respect of his minde and will, he had confidence in God, and knew that God would carry him through that great agony he was exercised with.

4. It was not a final dereliction; all this forsaking was but for a time, he had before and after more comfortable apprehensions; for formerly, when he had told his Disciples, *That all would forsake him, and leave him alone*, he corrects that speech, *I am not alone, but my Father is with me*, John 16. 32. This he spake before the temptation, but in the temptation he had not that comfortable sense of his presence.

Sixthly, In this Controversie therefore we must necessarily consider *Christ as sustaining two Persons, his own and ours.* 6.
In his own Person he was altogether holy and innocent, free from all sinne, and most beloved of his Father, from whom no show of anger could appear, if considered in his own Person. But then, if he be considered as bearing our person, in which respect he is called our Surety, Heb. 7. 2. *and our sinnes laid upon him; So he apprehended the anger of God, and was to satisfie the Justice of God, by bearing that punishment which was due to us.* Therefore that Argument is very weak, which would prove Christ not to bear Gods wrath, because he was alwayes beloved of his Father: For this is true in respect of his own Person; but then as covenanting for us, so he was to conflict with Gods anger; for why was it, that though beloved of God, and most innocent, that he should suffer death, and that so painfull, that the Adversaries acknowledge it to be the extreamest suffering that could be in a way of grief and pain? But only for our sinnes, because he stood in our stead; and as the *Javelin* which was runne at *David* missed him, and stuck fast in the wall; So the anger of God which was to have run on us with all violence, by Christs interposing of himself, passed by us, and fell on him.

These Propositions thus cleared, you may by the help of their light answer all contrary Objections; I therefore proceed

ceed by positive Arguments to confirm this truth; for its very profitable in regard of the practical use which may be made thereof, to know that Christ suffered in his soul, and that the anger of God, as well as in his body. And

Arguments to prove that Christ suffered the anger of God in his soul as well as in his body.

I.

The first *Argument* is founded on *Gal.*3.13. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us, &c.* Thus we form it, *The curse of the Law did reach to the terrours of the soul, as well as to the pains of the body: But Christ was made the curse of the Law for us*; he doth not say, Christ was made accursed, but *κατάρα*, *a curse in the abstract*, to shew how greatly he was accursed in this death; Neither may you say, This execration was in respect of men, that men judged him execrable, for his enemies looked upon him as worse then *Barabbas*; but this curse is in respect of God, as appeareth by the testimony alledged out of *Deut.* 21.23. for though the Apostle intending the sense, and not the words, omits the mention of God; yet in the foresaid place of *Deuteronomy* it is, *He that is hanged is accursed of God.* This is universally true, for though innocent and holy Martyrs have been hanged on the Tree, and so their persons were accepted of and beloved, yet the kinde of death was made by God amongst the Jews an accursed death, partly in a civil and political sense, such a death being inflicted onely for atrocious and hainous sinnes; partly in a typical sense, to prefigure Christs death: So that as the lifting up of the brazen Serpent was a type of Christ crucified, so that kinde of death amongst the Jews in a particular manner accursed by God, called in the Hebrew *The curse of God* likewise in the abstract, was typical and prefigurative of Christs death.

If it be said, That this curse was onely in his bodily suffering that manner of death.

I answer, That cannot be all, for its called *the curse of the Law* that Christ was made, and such as he redeemeth us from, and that is not onely of the body. And again, its such a curse that is opposed to the blessing of *Abraham*, and that was spiritual in the soul as well as the body: So that unlesse they will say, The Law cursed the body only, they must not limit

limit Christs being *made a curse for us* to his bodily sufferings. Indeed the Scripture doth often instance in that, excluding his sufferings of his soul, but because his bodily suffering was most visible to the eye, though in other places it speaks in the general, not naming his blood, as when its said, *It behoved Christ to suffer, and so to enter into glory*, Luk. 9. 22. *& alibi.*

A second *Argument* from the threatning, *Genes.* 2. 17. *In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die.* This place is brought by all the Orthodox against the *Socinians*, to prove the necessity of Christs death by way of an Atonement and Satisfaction to Gods justice; for seeing how God threatned upon mans sinne, that he should die, and the verity and the justice of God will not suffer this to be violated, therefore it behoved Christ to come and to be a Sacrifice for sinne. Now by death is meant not onely a meerly bodily death, but all other spiritual punishments of the soul; Therefore by what reason the justice of God did require he should suffer in his body, the same did require he should suffer in his soul; for what reason can be given, why God should release one part of the debt more then the other? If it be said, that because Christs death was the death of him who was God as well as man, it had an infinite value, and therefore the sufferings of his body were equivalent to those sufferings which we should have had in our souls. 24

I answer, The meer and absolute infinity of a price, is not enough to satisfie, unlesse it be commensurated to the sentence that is adjudged by him, who is to be satisfied: for why is it that with the Papists we dare not say, one drop of Christs blood had been enough to satisfie for us, seeing it had an infinite dignity in it, but because it was not answerable to Gods sentence which required death? So we may say, The infinite value in Christs meer bodily suffering was not enough, because the sentence required more satisfaction. But if you say, The death of the soul implieth sinne, despair, and all such impiety as cannot without blasphemy be attributed to Christ. I answer, The punishments of sinne in the soul, are either such as are meer sinne, such as unbe-

liefe, privation of the image of God. Or

2. Such as are punishments and sinnes too: such are the despair and blasphemy of the damned in hell, with the gnawing worm of conscience in them. And

Lastly, Such as are meerly punishments, such are the meer want of Gods favour for a time, sad conflicts and agonies arising in the soul hereupon. Now these, though in us they would necessarily produce sinne, yet in Christ they did not, because of his pure nature: Therefore though the threatning doth not inferre Christ should die in his soul in a sinful manner, yet as far as the threatning could be accomplished in Christs soul without sinne, it did behove him to endure, that so the justice of God may be satisfied.

3. A third *Argument* is taken *from the relation Christ stood in, while he suffered, he died not simply in relation to his own person, he was our Surety, and he died for us in our stead*; and thus the Prophet saith, *All our sins were laid on him*; It behoved therefore our Surety to suffer all that we should have suffered, as farre as there was a consistency with his holy nature; And the Adversaries to Christs sufferings in his soul, do upon this Argument reject his propitiatory death, because if so (say they) he must then suffer the pains of the damned. To which the Orthodox reply, That he suffered them equivalently, his holy nature would not suffer him to receive any sinful infirmities, *but he was tempted in all things like us, onely without sinne*; compare those places, *Heb.*2.17,18. *Heb.*4.15. where Christ was to be tempted in all things like us, in spiritual temptations as well as temporal; not that he was to endure every individual temptation in his soul, no more then every individual pain in his body, only in the general it behoved him to be thus tempted, that so he might have compassion on his members in their temptations.

4. The last *Argument* is, *from the remarkable description of those sufferings which were antecedent and concomitant to his death.* The Evangelists expressions are so remarkable, that its a wonder any should think that it was only the fear of death, that should thus possesse him, *Mat.*26. *Luk.*22. Before his death, the Evangelists record, that Christ said, *His soul was heavy to death.*

1. His

1. His soul, this sorrow it was in his will, as *Maldonat* and *Melchior Canus* grant, though Papists. The greatest grief that could be did seise upon his will, and therefore it was his natural will that desired the Cup might passe away, though with submission to Gods will, and then his soul was περίλυπος, sorrowfull round about, and that even to death, yea its said, he began ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, to be astonished and ἀδημονεῖν to faint away; insomuch that an Angel came to comfort him, yea for anguish great drops of blood fell from him to the ground, and in his time of suffering, he cried out, *My God, Why hast thou forsaken?* I do not say, No Martyr, but no man scarce ever shewed such fear of death, and shall we think Christ was put into this anguish had there not been a greater cause then death only? Adde to these *Heb.*5.7. Neither can those of a contrary minde give a good reason, why the Martyrs should shew such courage, and Christ manifest such extraordinary agonies, but that our sins were laid on him, but they felt the pardon of them.

This Doctrine hath a three-fold cord of practical matter, which should not be broken.

1. To take notice and be astonished at his love, who gave himself thus to suffer in his soul; all his bodily pains did not amount to the least of his souls grief.

2. To detest sin, and to see the heavy nature of it, that cannot be expiated without so much sorrow. And

Lastly, Of gratitude and thankfulnesse to Christ: Oh what strong obligations are upon us, to part with every thing for his sake, who was willing thus to be wounded and bruised for us! No wonder *Paul* crieth out, *He desireth to know nothing but Christ crucified.*

SERM.

SERM. XXXIII.

Whether Christ while on earth, did truly and properly obey *the will of God.*

ROM. 5. 19.

For as by one mans disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

THe Apostle at the close of *ver.* 14. doth begin an admirable comparison or collation, between the first *Adam*, and Christ the second. It was the wicked opinion of the Manichees, that they asserted two principles, *one good*, the fountain of all good, the other *evil*, the cause of all evil: But here in a good sense we see described two different or contrary originals to mankinde; the one is of *sinne* with all the evil consequents thereof: the other of *grace*, with the admirable effects thereof. Now *Adams* offence and Christs obedience are compared in their nature, their force and efficacy, and lastly their ends: But the Apostle, as he sheweth their agreement, so also he giveth their disparity and disagreement, making the righteousnes of Christ to be more abounding to Justification, then *Adams* sinne could be to condemnation. The Text I have pitched on, is a summary repetition of all that had been said, and a brief collection of their agreement together: In the former part you have the *antecedent*, *As by one mans disobedience many were made sinners.*

The

The Apostle calls *Adams* sinne sometimes *παράπτωμα*, and that very properly, because it was such a fall that brought ruine to him and to all his posterity; in this verse its called *παρακοὴ*, for disobedience was remarkable in that sinne; yea whereas disobedience in a general sense is in every sinne, some have thought, that the spiritual nature of this sinne was disobedience; that as pride or uncleanness are specifical sinnes, thus *Adams* sinne was disobedience. The *Apodosis* is, *So by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.*

In the words you have the *person* compared, *One*, that is Christ: he doth not say one man, as before, though that be necessarily implied. 2. The matter in which the comparison is instituted, *by one mans obedience*, *ὑπακοὴ*; that which he called *δικαίωμα* before, is here called *ὑπακοὴ*. 3. The effects or end of this, *Many shall be made righteous*. *Many*, this is opposed to that *One*, by whom obedience was performed; so that the Dispute about universality of Redemption or Grace, is wholly impertinent to this Text and those preceding, for *many* and *all* are not compared in respect of mankinde, but in respect of the *original* or *root*, which is *One*, (*shall be made righteous.*) This is not to be understood of inherent righteousness, but imputed; and although it be in the future tense, that doth not signifie the compleat and perfect making of us righteous in heaven, as *Pareus* would have, but the continual and daily efficacy of Christs obedience upon all the godly, who shall be in their successive generations to the end of the world, as *Beza* most solidly.

Now whether this obedience of Christ be to be limitted onely to that free and willing *offering of himself to die for us*, or to be taken largely for that *whole course of life which was spent in obeying of the law and will of God*, is disputed by interpreters. Those that deny the imputation of Christs active obedience, limit it only to that specifical and particular obedience of Christ in his death. But those of a contrary way take it largely, for *all the obedience of Christ, which he accomplished both in doing and suffering.* With these I joyn as conceiving they have the truth of God on their side: and from what Objections they bring, I shall fully vindicate this Text,

Reasons why the imputation of Christs obedience is not to be limited to that which Divines usually cal passive.

when in order of method I am to establish my Arguments for the affirmative: Onely for the present, That obedience is not to be limited to that which Divines call usually passive, may appear from these Reasons.

1. *The sense of the Scripture when it speaks generally, is not to be limited unless necessity compell.* If the Apostle say, obedience in the general, who may say, it was not all, but some?

2. *The antithesis or opposition may evince it.* *Adams* disobedience was an action dissonant, or contrary to the Law of God: Therefore Christs obedience must be a conformity to the Law.

3. *Because this obedience is called,* v. 18. *Christs righteousness.* Now the sufferings of Christ are never called in Scripture his righteousnes: They are indeed our righteousnes, but not his, whereas his obedience is his own righteousnes as well as ours; and indeed the very word Obedience, doth properly denote a conformity to the Law.

4. *Because by this obedience,* v. 17. *we are said to have the gift of righteousnesse, and thereby reign in life.* Now Christs suffering for us is but part of that righteousnesse, neither is eternall life promised meerly to a man because his sinne is pardoned, but because he hath that perfect holinesse the Law requireth, as hath been and shall be (God willing) more at large proved.

5. *Because the Apostle at other times speaking of Christs obedience, doth make that of his death but one particular act or instance of it.* *Phil.* 2. 8. Christ is there said to become *obedient unto death,* his obedience was terminated in that which doth necessarily presuppose that it was demonstrated in other things before, from the matter or nature wherein this comparison is made, *viz.* obedience: Observe,

Observe.

First, *That Christ, while in the dayes of his flesh here on earth, did truly and properly obey God the Father.* He was in a state of obedience; that as *Adams* sinne was truly and properly disobedience, so was the conformity of Christs actions unto the Law of God, truly and properly obedience.

Having already shewed, that the sufferings of Christ are made

made our righteousness. Now we are arrived at that noble and famous Question, *whether that obedience of his he performed, whilst on earth to God's Law, be part of our righteousness before God?* That is, we are to look upon Christ as suffering the penalty of the Law in Christ's suffering, so also as perfectly fulfilling the Law in Christ's obedience. And because this cannot be clearly determined, unless we first know the nature of Christ's obedience in the general, with the divisions thereof, therefore I have laid down this first Proposition,

I. That Christ while on the earth, did truly and properly obey the will of God.

And to manifest the truth hereof, consider these ensuing propositions.

First, It may seem very difficult to explain how it was possible that Christ should in a true and formal sense be said to obey, and that from two considerations: 1. His hypostatical union, and 2. That unction of God, which he did receive. For the former, seeing his humane nature was united to the godhead in one person, so that there was but one *suppositum*, and that *divinum*. How could Christ be said to obey? for if we cannot say that God did obey, no more may we say Christ could obey, seeing he is the Person God-man. But of this more is to be said in answering the Objection, and this Question will then be discussed, *whether the hypostatical union doth absolve Christ from any obligation to the Law*, so that we may not say of him, as we do of all men, that they are bound to keep the Law of God. The second ground of this difficulty is, because of the unction Christ received, God is said to anoint him with oyl *above his fellows*, and he did not receive the Spirit in measure, if then his inward habitual grace was so overflowing, how could he be said to obey, because obedience is properly where there is liberty? now not only the hypostatical union, but this spiritual Unction put him into a state of *impeccability*: If therefore Christ could do no otherwise then he did, for who may say he might have refused to take upon condition upon him, or to have forsaken our Suretiship,

tiship, when he had once undertaken it, if then he could not sin, how could he be said to obey?

2. Second Propos. This difficulty hath so extreamly perplexed some, that they have runne into gross and scandalous assertions, especially some Schoolmen, they have granted these Propositions as true, *Christus potuit peccare*, and *Christus potuit damnari*, (Durand. *lib.* 3. *sent. distin.* 12. *quæ.* 2.) certainly every Christian must reject this as blasphemous. Others they runne to a miracle in this case, (Molina. 1. *par. quæs.* 14. *pag.* 235.) That as it was a miracle in Christ, that though he injoyed the favour and light of Gods face beatifically, yet at the same time (which naturally is impossible) it should be so ordered by divine power, that he should have the highest degree of sorrow in his will, so its no lesse wonder, that Christ, by a faciall vision and intuitive beholding of God in a comprehensive and blessed manner, was not so determined and absolutely necessitated, but that he did obey God freely. If you ask the reason why they runne into such extravagancies, its because they receive this as an immovable axiom, standing as firm as heaven, *That there cannot be any obedience, but where there is liberty; and there cannot be any liberty, but where there is a power to do good or evil.* But that which they accounte as a rock, is altogether sandy, for learned men make it clear, that such an indifferency is not necessary to liberty, yea *posse peccare* doth not arise from liberty, but mutability and vertibility; seeing therefore liberty is a perfection, we must necessarily attribute it to Christ, and it did arise from the perfection of his holines, that he could not but obey; and whereas *Adam* had liberty, and therein a power to sinne, this was because *Adam* was made mutable, so that his power to sinne did not arise from his *liberty*, but his *changeablenesse*. Let it not then trouble us to say, How could Christ be said to obey, seeing he could do no otherwise? *for to be able to sinne is not constitutive of, or ingredient to liberty.* Christ had a willing and ready dominion over his acts, and in this was his liberty. That Christ did not, or could not but obey, did not arise from a natural necessity determining him, as the fire doth burn or the sunne shine, but from the glori-

ous

ous perfection of his holy Nature. This doctrine about Christs obedience doth also trouble the Remonstrants, who plow with the same Heifer that the Jesuites do, and therefore they say, (*Apolog. pro Confessi. pag.* 188.) That Christs obedience was of another nature then ours; Christ (say they) obeyed the will of his Father, not as we do, under the commination of eternal death, if we do not obey; God forbid: but as an Ambassadour his King, or as a beloved son his father, when a King or a father commit any honourable employment or service to him, that he may perform it, adding a promise of a most munificent remuneration if he will undertake it freely and for his sake; therefore, they say, Christ might not have undertaken this office of a Surety, or when he had undertaken it, he might have relinquished it, or he might not have delighted in the reward promised. Thus they are forced into precipices, that are driven by that unmeasured doctrine of indifferency and indeterminateness ingredient to all liberty. Its true indeed, Christ might have refused to have been our Surety, if it had been of necessity, it could not be by the Scripture so magnified to be of grace. It was a free and spontaneous offering of himself, *Lo I come to do thy will, O God*, and although he had an infinite love to Gods glory, yet that did not necessitate him to undertake to redeem mankinde, more then the apostate Angels. But when Christ had once agreed with the Father, and accepted of this Office, then he could not *subterfuge*, nor did it stand with his faithfulness and holiness to relinquish it. They were then given by the Father to him, *John* 17. as his charge and as his trust, and therefore he could not be found unfaithfull therein: Christ did obey the Father, though such was his perfection and immutable holiness, that he could not do otherwise.

Third Propos. Notwithstanding this position, that Christ did truly and properly obey, yet you must understand it in a right sense, for in some considerations Christ could not be said to obey: for in Christ we are to consider two Natures, his Divine and his humane: in respect of his Divine Nature, he could not be subject to the Father, for so he was of the same 3.

same equal Nature, and indeed 'tis a contradiction to say, that God can be bound to obey, for that would imply he was not God, that there was a greater and more Supream then He.

Again, Christ may be considered in respect of his personal subsistence, and that being Divine, in that respect he could not be said to be obedient or subject to any Law. The Arians were condemned for holding Christ in respect of his *suppositum*, to be subject to a Law, for they made this only an humane subsistency. The Nestorians also, because they affirmed Christ had a twofold suppositality, Divine and Humane, and in respect of his Humane to be subjected, were likewise condemned. If therefore Christ be considered in respect of his subsistency, this being wholly Divine, so that he is a Divine and not an humane *suppositum* or person subsisting, then he cannot be said properly to obey. And upon this account it is that Divines of great note, willingly yield to the adversaries of Christs active obedience, that he was bound to the Law of God for himself, but that he was above the Law, and therefore what he did, he did wholly for us, being no more bound to obey the Law, then to suffer: for seeing (they say) that Laws are properly given not to natures, but to persons subsisting, and Christ was Divine, as a person subsisting, therefore he could not be under a Law. But how farre this hath truth, is in time to be discussed: and we proceed to a

4. Fourth Propos. That Christ considered as a man, and in respect of his humane nature, might, and did properly obey; and if we believe Christ to be a man it must needs be so: for seeing the humane nature of Christ had not a supream essential and infinite holiness, in which sense Christ said, *Mat.* 19. 17. *None is good but God*, it was impossible that it should be above all rule of holiness, and though a creature, yet not subjected to the rule of all holiness, which is Gods increated will; and therefore when Christ is called the *servant* of God, it is a proper and not a metaphorical speech, as when he is called a *vine* and a *door*: and indeed to deny obedience to Christ, as he was man, is to overthrow our whole Redemption.

Neither

Neither may we look upon Christ in the state of a Mediatour, as the Remonstrants say an Ambassadour or a beloved son, as if there were only a mutual and friendly agreement between the Father and the Sonne, but there was a subordination and humiliation, in which sense Christ cals the Father Lord, and he cals him his servant.

But in the fifth place, Christ was in this obedient way to the Father, only while he was in the flesh, I say, while he was in the flesh, not as if Christ had now deposited his humane nature, or were not still man; but alluding to the Apostle, *Heb.* 5. 7. when he saith, *Christ in the dayes of his flesh offered up prayers and supplications with teares*; so that though a Sonne, yet *he learned obedience by the things which he suffered.* So that the humane nature of Christ, while in the state of humiliation, did properly and truly obey the Law of God: And in this sense Christ saith, *his Father is greater then he*, *John* 14. 28. not only in respect of his humane nature, but also of that state of humiliation he was in; he was not yet exalted to that glory, to sit at the right hand of God, and to be in visible Majesty and glory equal to God the Father; and this may be part of the meaning of that place, 2 *Cor.* 5. 16. *Henceforth know we no man after the flesh, though we have known him so*: That is, we look upon him now as risen again, as glorified, as becoming a new Christ, as it were, he is now exalted, and not subject to those frailties, nor in that state of humiliation as we once knew him to be in. The humane nature therefore of Christ, while in the state of humiliation was subject to the Law of God, and so capable of obedience: This is to be observed, for Christ might have taken our nature upon him in a glorified way, and not in a servile: To be above the Law, and not made under the Law. As the humane nature of Christ now is in heaven, it doth not cease to be a creature; yet we cannot say, Christ is there in a state of obedience; for although the humane nature of Christ doth love God, and delight in him, yet it doth not this from subjection but from perfection. The holiness it puts forth in heaven, is not so much to be considered as a duty, but as part of that beatitude and glory it hath. Its obedience

5.

not

not formally but materially; to be sure its not such as to which a promise is made. Those that deny Christs active obedience imputed to us, because it was a debt which every creature oweth to God, and so he was obliged to this, may do well to consider, that the humane nature of Christ, though glorified in heaven, is yet a creature, but the holy actions thereof are not by way of a duty so properly, but are parts of its blessednes. But of this more in its time.

6. Sixth Propos. It may not then be denied, that Christ in respect of his humane nature, while in the state of humiliation, was truly subjected to the Law, and so under obedience: a twofold law he was subjected unto, one generall, whereby he obeyed that Law which was common to all other men with him, in which sense, *Mat.*5. he saith, *he came to fulfill the Law*, which was not only by doctrinall exposition of it, but by practicall obedience to it, yea not onely the Moral Law, but even the Ceremonial Law also, which although it was given to sinners, and denoted some kinde of expiation, yet Christ subjected himself to it, not for himself, but for us, who were sinners, that so the *Righteousnesse of that, the righteousnesse of all the Law of God might be fulfilled in us.* The particular Law he was subject unto, was that peculiar precept of dying for us. Now that Christ was truly obedient unto the Father, and subjected thus to the Law, may appear partly by those texts wherein his obedience is spoken of, *Phil.*2.8. and *Heb.*5.7. and *Isa.*53. where he is called *Gods righteous servant*, partly and more principally in that God is said to command him, and he is said to keep his commands.

7. Hence Propos.7. Christs obedience was truly so, because it was done to his Fathers command, which was truly and really a command, *Act.*7.37. compared with *Deut.*18.18. So Christ doth often call his Fathers will, in the work of our Redemption, a command, *John* 12. *John.*14. *John* 15.10. *If you keep my Commandments ye shall abide in my love, as I keep my Fathers Command, and abide in his.* Neither may these texts be expounded of a permission and not a command, for if so, then Christ might as well not have been our Redeemer as our Redeemer, yea he might have deserted it, after he had

begun

begun it, without any sinne at all: But this could not be, for had not a Law or command required this of Christ, his righteousnesse which he wrought for us could not be called δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου: neither could Christ himself, or we in him, be said to be dead to the Law, if that had not been satisfied; yea then Christ could not have said that notable profession, *Psal.* 40.7,8,9. *My ears hast thou opened; Behold I come to do thy will O God: Thy Law is within my heart.* As then the commands Christ gave his Disciples were truly and properly commands, not permissions, or bare insinuations of a will, so was that which Christ had of the Father, for in that of *John* 15.18. he makes them of the same nature.

Propos. 8. Though Christs obedience was properly to a command, yet this command was not imposed on him to the same ends as it is on men, for a command is given us for direction, to instruct the minde, and to quicken or stirre up the heart; but Christ needed neither of these, for his minde was fully indowed with all knowledge, and his heart was full of all ready affections to do Gods will; therefore he said it was his *meat and drink to do his Fathers will.* No hungry or thirsty man could more desire the relieving of those appetites, then he longed to do his Fathers command: If you ask whether this command had a threatning to it, for if not to obey would have been a sinne, then eternall death would have followed, and so the commination of damnation would have been by way of addition to the command imposed on him, as it is on us, But that is not necessary, for the command was not given to him, to stirre and quicken him up to his duty, as it is to us, but for other ends: Yea a learned Divine (*Cloppen. Syntag.* pag. 469.) doth acknowledge, that Christ was under the commination of the Law, but yet this did not strike any terrour into Christ, because the threatning in it self doth only inform of Gods hatred against sinne, it doth not inflict terrour but by accident, supposing a man to be fallen by sinne. Therefore *Adam* in the state of integrity had a threatning joyned to that explanatory command, which yet could not strike terrour into him, till he had sinned. Indeed this did inform him, how much God hated

8.

such transgression, and so thereby might inflame him to hate sin the more: But of this more, when we consider how Christ was under the Law. And certainly, the more we consider that Christ was in an obediential way, and became like a servant subject to God: As it did more debase him, so it ought to stirre us up to more thankfulnesse, and to make us say of every Law of Christ, which he did of that will of God to be our Redeemer, *Behold, I come to do thy will, thy Law is within my heart.*

SERM. XXXIV.

Divers Propositions tending to clear the Point of The Imputation of the Active Obedience of Christ. *And the Point truely stated.*

ROM. 5. 19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous:

WE proceed to a second Observation from these words, *viz.*

Observe. *That by Christs Obedience all believers are made righteous.*

That Christ was in a true and proper state of *Obedience* hath been demonstrated.

The-

The next thing to be considered is, *The relation of it to us*, and that is in those words, *We are made righteous by it.* A man may be made righteous two wayes, either legally by imputation, that which our Surety hath done being accounted to us; or qualitatively and inherently, by having the inward principles of righteousnesse, and acting accordingly. Popish Interpreters, they expound it this later way, and some other that are Orthodox, but without cause. *Stapleton* [*Antidot. in loc.*] thinketh there is a great advantage for their opinion of inherent righteousnesse in the words δικαιοι κατασταθησονται, which (saith he) implieth a true and real righteousnesse, not an imputed one; and wonders at *Beza*, that he should passe over the signification of this expression, who otherwise is very curious about words: Therefore he addeth two places where this word is used for his purpose, *Matt.* 24.47. *His master shall* καταστησει, *appoint or set over all his goods*; So *James* 4.4. *Whosoever will be a friend of the world,* καθιστατε, *he is an enemy of God*; that is (saith *Stapleton*) he is not by imputation, but really so. But this is easily answered, Though the Greek word be not δικαιουν, but δικαιον καθιστανειν, yet its the same sense; Even as with the Apostle *John*, who never useth the word δικαιουν, to justifie, yet hath an equivalent one, which is, not to come into judgment, what is that but *Pauls* to be *justified*? and thus to be made righteous is to be constituted, pronounced & dealt with as righteous; Therfore in the verse before its called *Justification of life*, and is opposed to κατακριμα *condemnation*. Besides, this is the wilfull and grosse mistake of *Stapleton* and his fellows, that they oppose true real righteousnesse, to imputed, which the Orthodox again and again disavow: Imputed righteousnesse and inherent differ not in their truth and reality, one is as true and as real a righteousnesse as another, but in the manner of communication or participation. We say, its as impossible to be made righteous without righteousnesse, as to be healthfull without health, to be wise without wisdome; onely we say, its not necessary this righteousnesse should be inherent, it may be by another's obedience procured for us, and so judged as if we had done it. Indeed there are some

things that do necessarily import an inherency in the Subject, and such things cannot be imputed, as health doth imply a necessity in existency, but righteousnesse is of another nature; we may in Law be acquitted by another satisfaction, or by the obedience of a Surety pronounced to have obeyed the Law, and here is no contradiction in this; and that this must necessarily be so interpreted here, appeareth by the opposition. By *Adams* disobedience we were made sinners, not only by propagation, but by imputation; *Adams* sinne was ours by imputation; It was not onely the private personal sinne of *Adam*, but the publique transgression of all. Thus Christs obedience was the obedience of all those he did undertake for. Its true, the imputed sinne of *Adam* to all mankinde, did cause inherent corruption in all; and thus we also grant, That the imputed righteousnesse of Christ doth work in us inherent righteousnesse, but this is not that by which we are freed from condemnation. And as for the use of the word δικαιωμα, the place he first instanceth in maketh against him, for to that we may adde others of the like nature, *Luk.* 12.14. *Act.*6.3. *Tit.*1.5. where the word signifieth a legal constituting and appointing of a person to some office or imploiment: and thus it doth in this place signifie a legal constituting and making of us just, that whereas before the Law did in every thing accuse us, we are now acquitted and declared righteous.

Thus you see the Text vindicated, and this Proposition genuinely built thereon, *That a believer is made righteous, not by his own, but by Christs obedience*, and it hath been cleared, by obedience is meant in a general sense, his conformity to the whole Law and will of God, not that particular obedience onely manifested in his death on the Crosse. And thus *Calvin* upon this place, We could not be made righteous, unlesse we bring the perfect obedience of the Law, and that we cannot, but Christ must do it for us; So that it is to be wondered he should be brought in the number of those who are against Christs active obedience in this controversie, seeing he doth in so many places averre it.

Propositions to clear the point.

Before we come to establish this truth, some Propositions

fictions must be laid down to clear it. As

First, *That the obedience of Christ hath in this later age (by reason of different opinions newly raised) been divided into active and passive, calling his active that which was in obedience to the command of the Law, and his passive that which was in satisfying the penalty of it.* Now this distinction hath been rejected upon two grounds: 1.

The first (for which well it might) was for the absurd impropriety of it, calling it passive obedience, as if we should say active passion, for passion *qua* passion, or a meer suffering of punishment cannot be any satisfaction, or merit any reward. There must be an obediential resignation of a mans self, with readinesse and chearfulnesse to suffer, else it cannot be available; and therefore to speak properly, All obedience is active; even thus when it is in things to be suffered. Therefore more suitably to the Scripture we may say, *The obedience of his Passion, then passive obedience*; Yea, Divines say, *That all the actions of Christ had passion in them, and all his passions actions in them, from the very beginning to the end his obedience was with suffering, and his suffering with obedience.* Others reject this distinction, as being the Engine of the Remonstrants to divide and rent the Orthodox asunder. Thus *Lubbertus* [*contra Bert. & contra Vorst.*] doth several times disclaim it, attempting to be a Concilistor in the controversie, though enclining to the Doctrine of passive obedience only. But whether they were the authors or the fomentors of it, it lieth upon him to make good. Now although it be thus rejected; yet for distinction sake, [and because these terms are now generally used, I shall give them the titles of active and passive obedience of Christ, although I think it were better to avoid them, and in stead thereof to say, the whole humiliation of Christ in all the particulars acts thereof are made over to us for our righteousnesse. A censure of the terms active and passive obedience.

Secondly, *You may take notice, that this controversie in these terms, is but of late originals.* Not but that the Doctrine of Christs active obedience imputed unto us, was asserted in Antiquity, as learned men shew, but the controversie was not then agitated. The *Lutherans, Musculus, Brocke-* 2.

man, *Himelius*, &c. make *Piscator* to be the first Author of this opinion, *That Christs passive obedience is onely imputed to us for righteousnesse*. But *Lucius* a learned Writer in this controversie, and appearing for the active obedience of Christ, saith [*apud Gut: Animad. partis prioris. Sect. 1. p. 15.*] That the controversie first began amongst the *Lutherans* between *George Kargius* (against whom *Gomarus* hath defended the truth) and his collegues, which controversie was proposed to the Divines of *Wittenburg* to be discussed and decided, who gave in their judgement for the active obedience of Christ, yet amongst the *Calvinists* some did imbrace it, as *Olevian*, from whom, as being his Master, *Piscator* sucke it, and afterwards with much animosity propugned it, and since some few have gone that way. So that for any to say, *Vulgar unstudied Divines (except some few) do maintain the active obedience of Christ in the sense afterwards to be mentioned, is out of fear to vulgarity to runne into singularity*: For generally all the *Lutheran* Divines do make the active obedience of Christ with the passive, to be our compleat righteousnesse; And for the *Calvinists*, *Beza Annot. in cap. 5. ad Rom. v. 17. Junius Tom. 1. Thes. de Justif. Polanus Symph. Cattol. cap. 12. Thes. 10. Grynæus, Gomarus, Wallæus, Lucius, Andreæ, Rivetus, Cocceius, Cloppenburgius, Amesius*, &c. Insomuch that *Vorstius* said truly to *Lubbertus*, that it was the opinion of the chiefest Doctors of the Reformed Church [*Vorst. 52. apud Sybrand.*] Neither may those English Divines be called Vulgar, who have professedly avouched it, *Perkins* [*Reformed Catholick*] *Davenant*, *Downame* [*of Justification*] and others. Its true, we are not in matter of Doctrine primarily to look to any men or confessions, this is to call some men masters on earth: And *Durand* saith well, *Omnis homo dimittens rationem propter authoritatem humanam, incidit in insipientiam bestialem*. But yet when a Doctrine is decried either by the paucity or illiterateneße of the patrons thereof, then its necessary to shew who have not been ashamed to appear in publique for it. Its true, some (though but few comparatively) have appeared against Christs active obedience, and some of them acknowledged to be men of eminent

worth.

worth. But as *Augustine* of old to the *Manichees* spake excellently well in controverted matters, *Nemo nostrum dicat, jam se invenisse veritatem, sic eam quaramus quasi ab utrisque nesciatur.* Thus let all considerations of men and Antiquity be a while sepositid, as if the truth were already found out to our hands; but let us by the Scripture and Arguments deducible from it, so search for it, as if hitherto neither party had attained unto it.

Only the third *Proposition may be to advertize, That even amongst those who oppose the imputation of Christs active obedience, in the sense to be mentioned, there is a difference.* Piscator and those that rigidly follow him, limit our righteousnesse onely to Christs death, as the whole and compleat matter of our satisfaction; and as for his active obedience, they make that onely a qualification in him, who is the Mediator. They do not say, It was needlesse, or that in some sense it was not for our good, onely they affirm the proper and immediate effect of it, was to fit and dispose him to be our Mediator, and this they understand of his habitual holinesse, and not onely so, but of his actual also, which seemeth to be very strange Doctrine; for by this it will follow (as is to be more largely shewed) that Christ was not a qualified or fit Mediator for us, till he had accomplished the last act of his obedience; for if it be onely to qualifie him to be our Mediatour, then till he had fulfilled all his actual obedience, he could not have been our Mediator and Surety. Others they would have the controversie buried; and *Ursin, Paræus, Lubbertus*, though they be produced against Christs active obedience, yet they take upon them to be Conciliators, rather then to joyn to either party. *Paræus* is said [*Lubbert. contra Bertium, pag. 25.*] to call the Disputes about the active and passive obedience of Christ *inanes rixas*, but I cannot in my Edition finde those expressions; indeed he limits the obedience in my Text to that of Christs death (of which more afterwards.) Yet he grants, That Christ fulfilled the general Law, and that special Law also of a Redeemer. To be sure *Paræus* [*Comment. in Heb. 5. 8.*] saith, *Some dispute about the active and passive obedience of Christ*, Quidni utraque? *Why are we*

3.

are justified by both? And very remarkable is the 5th verse of the 5th Chapter of the *Hebrews*, he addeth, *That the effect of our salvation doth not flow from any part of his actions or passions, but from the whole work of Redemption most fully accomplished by him. Therefore we are not to divide Christ, or distract faith, seeking one part of our righteousnesse in his birth, another in habitual sanctity, another in integrity of life, another in obedience of death.* To this last I fully subscribe, but how it will consist with their other Positions, I see not. Others [M. *Brad. of Justif. cap.* 3. M. *Gatak. Animad. pag.* 2.] distinguish of 'Christs obedience, his legal obedience, and his servile: His 'legal obedience was that which consisted in conformity to 'the Law, and flowing from his most pure nature: His servile 'obedience is that which was done by him as in a state of humiliation; for Christ, though he took our nature upon him 'might have been immediately received into heaven, and so 'not have subjected himself to the Law in that debased manner as he did. So that these learned Authors do not make 'that actual obedience to be a qualification of him for to make 'an atonement for us by his death. But grant these particular 'acts of his obedience are imputed to us, and make up our 'compleat righteousnesse with his sufferings. Thus we see the dissent amongst those, that yet deny the imputation of Christs active obedience to us for our righteousnesse. But yet because these Authors do grant the imputation of Christs obedience in some sense, and deny in it other, Therefore

4. A fourth Proposition is, *That the full understanding of this truth, lieth in a right explication of the manner how we are made partakers of Christs righteousnesse.* We are in the dark, and cannot avoid confusion till we separate the light from the darkenesse, by declaring in what way we are advantaged by Christs righteousnesse; for seeing an imputation of Christs obedience in his doings, as well as his sufferings unto us, is acknowledged by all the Orthodox, yea and by Papists themselves; therefore here is the difficulty to know, how it is imputed, and how it is not. Now we may conceive this imputation possible two wayes:

1. That

That which is called by some virtually in opposition to formally, that is, when the whole obedience of Christ is made ours, that is, say they, for our good, for our benefit and advantage, but not so as to be our righteousnesse it self. And thus some hold no other imputation of it, but in this sense, that all which Christ did, yea and all that he had even his whole being was for our great advantage. Though the instance will not hold every way, yet it may well represent it, when *Paul* said, He suffered for the Churches sake, the meaning is not, as if *Pauls* sufferings were imputed to the Church, as Christs were, only they did tend to the good of the Church many wayes: So, say they, Christs habitual and actual holinesse did in many respects tend to our spiritual good, to our Justification, but are not any part of our righteousnesse. Here is an imputation granted, but in a very remote way.

Others, and they are Popish writers, grant an imputation in this sense, that his merits and satisfaction are communicated and applied to us, so that thereby we are inabled to fulfill the Law perfectly, and to satisfie God: So that Christs righteousnesse which he did, is not made our righteousnesse, but is the cause or merit of our righteousnesse, and therefore Christ is our righteousnesse with them, as *David* cals God often, his strength and his salvation, in a causal sense. Thus they grant an imputation in this sense, as if we should say, a mans money is accounted for his food and raiment, not that he feedeth on his money, or weareth his money, but because by this he he can procure them: So say they, Christs righteousnesse and obedience, its not that in which immediately we appear before God, and look to be justified by, but it procureth and obtaineth a righteousnesse for us.

Others, they say, There is an imputation of Christs obedience, and its part of our righteousnesse, but then they will not yeeld, that it should be so particularly applied to us, as that it should be equivalent to our keeping of the Law, or we to be said to fulfill the Law in him. Here is an imputation likewise of Christs active obedience, but none rise up to that fulnesse as the fourth and last explication doth, which

positively determine, *That Christs active obedience is in the same way required as his passive*: So that as in Christ suffering we were looked upon by God, as suffering in him: So by Christs obeying of the Law we were beheld, as fulfilling the Law in him: Insomuch that the active obedience is in the same manner imputed to us, as the passive; and the foundation laid down by them, is this, That a passive righteousnesse is not all the righteousnesse we are bound to have: Its not enough to have satisfied the penalty of the Law. There is a perfect obedience still expected from us; So that he who would appear in an universal compleat righteousnesse before God, must bring not only a satisfaction to the punishment, but a conformity to the Law, and they judge it a great derogating from Christ, and making him but half a Saviour, to affirm otherwise; and certainly if we do attend to what was our duty, and what the Office was Christ undertook for us, it seemeth to be very clear, that both the active and passive obedience of Christ, must concurre to make up our compleat righteousnesse. Though some Divines call it our formal righteousnesse, yet (as hath been said) because that expression is subject to logical disputes, we may call it our legal righteousnesse, or that matter whereby we stand justified, compleatly before God: the one is not enough without the other.

59 Fifthly, *It must be considered, That even amongst those that hold our Justification by Christs active righteousnesse, there are differences also.* For there is a three fold righteousnesse in Christ, 1. That which is essential, as he is God. 2. His habitual. 3. His actual. For his essential righteousnesse, as God; none have appeared to hold the imputation of that, but *Osiander*, and what followers he had, which opinion was almost like *Jonah*'s gourd, that did presently wither, and is by many Arguments confuted by *Calvin*, and therefore I shall not stand on that.

2. There is his habitual righteousnesse, and some affirm this to be imputed to us for our righteousnesse to cover our original and habitual corruption. But some deny this, as thinking that rather qualifying and constituting of him, and

so no more imputable to us, than his natures are; for this innate holinesse was only *presuppositive* and *materialiter* in him, as the Schools use to expresse such things, and was of the same consideration with his being and subsistency. Therefore

3. *There is a third obedience, whereby in an expresse manner he conformed himself to the Law of God, whatsoever it was either* generall *and* naturall, *which all men were obliged unto, or more* speciall *and* positive, *which the Jews and children of Abraham were bound unto; or yet more particular as a Redeemer and a Saviour, which he himself only was obliged unto. Now this actuall conformity unto the Law of God thus specified, is that righteousnesse* (say others) *which is made ours, and by his obedience unto it we are made righteous.*

These Propositions thus stated, the first Argument for the imputation of Christs righteousnesse, is to be rabbined upon this Text; for its a pregnant place, and speaks directly and positively what is contended for, *viz. That by Christs obedience a believer is made righteous*, whereas in other places Justification is attributed to his blood, here it is to his obedience, and that in a general unlimited sense. That this Argument may stand valid, its good to vindicate it from all exceptions; some have said that its meant of inherent righteousnesse, as if to be made righteous were to be inwardly sanctified: but that hath been refuted. Others, they limit this obedience, to the particular obedience of Christ, which was demonstrated in dying for us: This hath also been removed by several reasons.

Arguments for the imputation of Christs active obedience.

I. From the Text *Rom.* 5. 19.

Let us therefore consider what Arguments they have to move them to this interpretation. And

1. It's said, That which is here named in the Text, *The obedience of one*, is *verse* 18. called *one righteousnesse*. Now if it was but *one righteousnesse*, that cannot be applied to the several acts of righteousnesse, which Christ performed in his life time.

To this we answer, That it is readily granted, that *verse* 17. and 18. he may be, if we regard the original, as well one offence, as the offence of one: Therefore its so in the Margine of the Bible; and indeed as *Beza* well notes, If it were

not so in verſ. 17. there would ſeem to be a needleſſe redundancy; for thus its tranſlated, *by one mans offence Death reigned by one*; the latter *by one* ſeems to be tautologicall, unleſſe you underſtand the former by *one offence*, not *one mans offence*. Therefore an emphatical expreſſion is to be put upon thoſe paſſages, by that *offence of one*, and by that *righteouſneſſe of one*. But though this be granted in thoſe verſes, yet this Text doth expreſly name *man*, *By one mans diſobedience*, and *by the obedience of one* (though man be not in the Original, yet a perſon is ſuppoſed) So that we muſt forſake the very letter of the Scripture if we expound it ſo.

In the next place, its further pleaded, That we muſt underſtand it onely of Chriſts obedience in his death, becauſe of the oppoſition between *Adams* diſobedience and Chriſts obedience. *Now* (ſay they) *as Adams diſobedience, which did condemn us, was one ſinne; ſo Chriſts obedience which muſt juſtifie us, is but one act of obedience.*

But firſt, There is not the ſame reaſon of *Adams* diſobedience and Chriſts obedience in every thing, and certainly the Apoſtle maketh a great diſſimilitude as well as agreement, and it may ſeem even in this very thing at verſ. 17. for there the Apoſtle makes it one ſinne *that brought death*, but its the *abundance of grace*, and *the gift of righteouſneſſe thus brings life*. The oppoſition lieth between *Adams* one ſin, and Chriſts abundance of righteouſneſſe.

Again, There is not the ſame reaſon, becauſe one ſinne is enough to condemn; but more then one act of obedience is required to juſtifie; hence we ſay, Though *Adam* condemned all, yea the greater part of man ſhall be actually damned, and Chriſt he juſtifieth and ſaveth but a few, yet Chriſt the ſecond *Adam* is more potent then the firſt, becauſe there is required more efficacy to ſave one, then is to condemn many; as there is to reſtore one man to life, more then to kill many.

Furthermore, Chriſts obedience may be called one, even as *Adams* diſobedience; for as Divines ſay, His ſinne was not one ſingle, ſimple ſin, but many ſins, were ingredient therein,

which

which made it to be a very heinous transgression: Thus Christs whole obedience, is but one entire and compleat obedience consisting of many acts, even as the adversaries must acknowledge Christs sufferings was one compleat obedience integrated of many particular kindes of sufferings, for it was not one numericall suffering that procured our Redemption, he suffered from men and from God, in his body and in his soul, extream grief and torment in his body, as also the sense of Gods wrath in his soul, as *Piscator* doth acknowledge.

SERM. XXXV.

Arguments to prove the Imputation of Christs active obedience to us for our Justification.

ROM. 5. 19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made Righteous.

THere are further assaults to get this strong hold out of our hands: But this we are to maintain, *That by the whole obedience of Christ, we are made righteous.* Let us therefore consider what further Answers are brought to this Argument. And in the next place, its said,

Answ. *By obedience is meant only passive obedience, because the Scripture in other places doth alwaies attribute our Justification and Redemption to Christs death: Therefore it must be so understood here.* This is judged a strong Answer and likely to prevail.

Reply. But 1. The Scripture doth not alwaies attribute our Justifi-

fication or Salvation to his death; for *cap.* 4. *v.* 25. its there given to his resurrection, *He rose again for our Justification*: and at the 18th *verse* of this Chapter, its said, *By the righteousnesse of one, the free gift came upon all to Justification of life*: yea *Phil.* 2. 8. the work of our Redemption is wrought by Christ in the whole state of his humiliation, *Being in the form of a servant, and obedient unto death, even the death of the cross*: Where all that obedience he shewed unto God, antecedently to his death is taken notice of; and what is it to be redeemed from the curse of the Law, but to be justified? yet that *Gal.* 4. 4. is attributed unto *Christs being under the Law*; so that we see Christs death is not every where expressed as the cause of our Justification and Redemption.

2. Its granted, that in very many places our Justification, and forgivenesse of sinnes is attributed to the death of Christ, but not exclusively or negatively, so as to deny the other acts of his obedience, but because in this was demonstrated most eminently his obedience, as also his love to us: We are then by his death to understand, *all that course of humiliation he did so willingly undergo, which was at last consummated in his death*. And this may well satisfie the Piscatorians, for seeing they hold that it was not meerly Christs death that was an atonement, but as laid down by him who in his soul was fully apprehensive of the wrath of God against sinne; so that those sufferings in his soul made the greatest part of a sacrifice for our sinnes, it must needs follow, that by death they cannot barely mean death, but something more. And as the strict adhering to the words death and blood, would exclude the sufferings of his soul, so all his other sufferings, which yet the Scripture takes great notice of, the reproaches and revilings he indured, but especially those agonies and great conflicts he had, while in the garden with his Disciples, that were before his death. It is a good rule and of use in this case, *In Homogeneis connexis & subordinatis unius inclusio non est alterius exclusio*. But its good to follow the Scripture in the universal extent of it in describing all that is done for us by Christ: some remove his active obedience, restraining it to his passive; others they denounce his passive obedience, taking

bring away the greatest part of that, and limit it to a bodily sufferings Then come others at the last, and they take away even his bodily suffering also, as to be any imputed righteousnesse to us by way of satisfaction to the justice of God, so that its dangerous to remove those Land marks the Scripture hath set us; when you once begin to take any part away of Christs humiliation, as not imputed to us, its hard to say where you will stay: and its again and again to be considered, whether by the same reason you take away part, you do not remove all; certainly the Socinian thinketh by the same blow to beat down all.

The next Answer that is runne unto as a sanctuary, is, *That the opposition seemeth to necessitate us, that we restrain it to passive obedience only: for thus they observe, As the disobedience by Adam was not a transgression of the morall and generall Law, which did binde him as a man, but it was a special command, by way of trial, and obliging only in that case; so the obedience of Christ must be not to the morall and generall Law, but to some special command, which was to be a Mediatour, and so to die for us.* But its well observed by the Antagonists, that the Apostle makes the opposition between *Adams* disobedience, and Christs obedience, as the disease and the remedy, and so we must look for a contrariety, not an identity at least in the manner of curing; otherwise we must say it behoved Christ to have a command about the eating or not eating of the fruit of some tree, that so the obedience and disobedience might have agreed. Every one seeth absurdity in this inference. In the second place, *Adam* in transgressing that positive special command, did at the same time sinne against the generall and morall Law, its impossible to break any positive precept, and not to break the generall Law of God; for the morall Law of God requireth obedience unto him in whatsoever he shall require, only positive commands may specifie or institute some matter or *medium*, which was not expressly commanded by the morall Law. Thus all the ceremoniall worship which was introduced by positive precepts, yet is reduced to the second Commandment.

Answ.

Reply.

As for those who say that Adam could not have transgressed *Answ.*

the

the morall Law, because that was written in his heart, and so was made perfect. Such argue so feebly, that no answer is necessary, yet *ex abundanti*, we may tell them, that though *Adam* was created perfect, yet moteable and changeable: Besides by this argument he could not break a positive law neither, for to sinne against any kinde of Law, and especially in such a matter as *Adam* did, must needs argue he did degenerate and fall from his perfection. Furthermore, *Adams* sinne was not only in the actual eating of the forbidden fruit, but it was in unbelief, and distrust in Gods Word, and many other sinnes were either internally antecedent to the eating, or concomitant of it, which could not but be transgressions of the morall Law. And thus on the contrary it was with Christs obedience, for he did not only obey that special Law of a Mediatour, but the whole Law of God which we are obliged to, for the special was in some sense included in the generall, and he who undertaketh to bring us to a perfect and plenary righteousnesse, must not only satisfie the Law, but obey it also: But of this more when we consider that text, *Gal.* 4. of Christs being under the Law, and thereby redeeming us.

Rep.

Answ. They bring a third Answer to enervate this Argument: for it is said, *That we prove from a generall expression of obtaining such a thing, a determinate manner of obtaining it, which cannot be any good way of reasoning. It doth not follow, that because* Peter *died, that therefore he died of such a disease, or was slain by the sword: so neither here doth it hold, that because we are made righteous by Christs obedience, that therefore his active obedience is accounted as if we had done: for we may be made righteous otherwaies.*

Rep. But 1. Not only the generall, but the determinate manner is contained in the argument, for we are made righteous by Christs obedience, as we are sinners by *Adams* disobedience, and that is by imputation: believers in Christ are made righteous, as we in *Adam* are made sinners. Thus the Apostle doth not onely declare the benefit, but the manner of communicating it to us; for its a great part of the Apostles scope to shew how by *Adam* we come to die, and how by Christ we come to live.

2. If

3. If there were as many wayes to be made righteous, as there are for men to die; here might be some pretence to escape the force of the Argument: but there are but two wayes mentioned by the Scripture, Imputed and Inherent, or our righteousnesse, and the righteousnesse of God: a righteousnesse of faith and of works: so that if we are not constituted inherently righteous as to the matter of Justification by Christs obedience, its necessary it must be by imputation. And although men imagine several senses and wayes of imputation of righteousnesse, yet that is no more to be regarded in this point, then in other Doctrinal Controversies, when the Orthodox seeing those many texts of Scripture, which speak of Christs dying for us, to prove a satisfactory atonement unto the justice of God, by his death, and that it is in our stead, as if we had suffered: If a Socinian carpler should say, that they argue from a general to a determinate manner, Christ might die for example and for doctrine, not for satisfaction, or there may be a metaphorical and improper redeeming, would this be admitted as of any validity? no certainly: For its not enough to put many senses and interpretations upon the place, and then to say, The Scripture doth not prove it, unless it specifie such or such a sense: This is to make it impossible to prove any thing almost in a determinate sense out of the Scripture, against an heretical interpretation.

Lastly, They seek to the shadow of that opinion, *That Adams sinne is not ours by imputation, and if this can be made good, then they think the foundation of the Argument is razed; for then they affirm, that* Adams actual sinne of eating the forbidden fruit *is not made ours by imputation, but Adam sinning, and thereby losing the Image of God, we descending of him, as the root, have by natural propagation an uncleanness: For who can bring an unclean thing out of Adam? Thus we sinned in Adam, not by imputation, but because he being the original, and source of all mankinde, the fountain was polluted and thereby all the streams.* Arg.

To Answer this fully would require a large Tractate: It cannot be denied but the objection is very considerable, and Answ.

of great consequence: for *Austin* said well, (*lib. de peccato Origi. cap.* 14.) That in the cause of those two men, *Adam*, and Christ, whereof by the one we are sold under sinne, and by the other we are redeemed from sinne, the Christian faith doth properly consist. That we are made sinners by *Adams* disobedience, is so plainly and positively set down in this text, that none can deny it: But how we are, that is controverted. The Pelagians of old, understood it by imitation only: but because infants die, which yet could not imitate *Adam*, therefore that hath been easily refuted.

Others interpret to be a sinner, to be guilty; as sinne is often put for guilt, and so they will not yield, that we have properly the sinne of *Adam* made ours, only we are *sub reatu*, not *culpâ*, under guilt, not sinne by him.

Others, they grant we are made sinners by him, but inherently, by natural propagation.

Lastly, Those that seem to have the truth on their sides, affirm, that we are not only made sinfull by him, being born of him that was an unclean root, but that also his very actual transgression was made ours: That his sinne was not only *Adams* personal actual sinne, but also by Covenant and imputation the sinne of all mankinde. Its true that custome and use in the Church of God, doth now call that only Original sinne, which every one hath as soon as he is born, but yet *Adams* first actual transgression may be called Original sinne, in an active sinne, as being the cause of that original passive sinne in us; now if this be so, then is *Adams* actual disobedience was ours by imputation, so Christs obedience is also ours in the like manner. Its true some will hardly admit this, therefore *Peltanus* a Jesuite, (*lib. de Origin. peccato*, pag. 110, 111.) refuseth this opinion, which *Catharinus* and *Piglius* defended, for this reason amongst others, because, saith he, it doth plainly favour their errour, who in this age urge the figment of imputed righteousnes. But *Adam* is not to be considered only as a *root* and a *naturall principle*, but as a *publique person*, with whom God made a Covenant for himself and his posterity, that upon his persevering obedience, he and his posterity should be established in holinesse and life,

but

but upon his disobedience, he and all his should be deprived of both. *Now Adam who was then a publique Person, and a common Trustee, as it were, for all mankinde disobeying*, we became sinners, *not only by natural propagation, but by imputation.* The Covenant makes it to be our act as well as his, and this may appear to be true by these Reasons. First, Because the Apostle in this Chapter, *ver.* 12. saith, that *in him all have sinned*, whether it be *in whom*, or *for that*, all will come to one issue. All sinned in him, or because he sinned all sinned, which cannot be understood of any other, but *Adams* actual disobedience. Now to say, All sinned in him, is more then to say, All are made sinners by him: The one denoteth an act, the other an habitual qualification. If it were only said, We are made sinners by him, that might inforce no more then what the opponents affirm, *viz.* that by descent from him we have inherent pollution, that doth really constitute us sinners; but when we are so made sinners, that thereby we did sinne in him, we were *peccantes*, as well as *peccatores*: This cannot be any other way but by imputation, or some compact. 2. If it were by natural propagation only that we are made sinners by *Adam*, then there is no reason to attribute all to *Adam*, to one man, and to that one offence; for we may as well charge it upon all other immediate parents, as well as he. If you look only to natural descent, and set aside the Covenant and Imputation, then there is no difference between *Adam* and other parents, it might be as well said, we sinned in many men, as in one; and we might as well say, by any other mans disobedience we are made sinners, as by *Adams*. Again, If it were not by imputation, but natural propagation, Why should that one disobedience of *Adams* be mentioned more then other sinnes? Why should not all those sinnes after his fall be pitched upon, as well as that offence onely? Is not all this because in that parricular command *Adam* was a publique person, and so covenanted with, and what he did was the act of all mankinde? as what the Master of a Society doth, if impowred thereunto, is the act of all the Society. Lastly, It must be by imputation, not natural descent, because if *Adam* had not fallen, all Divines

agree that not only himself, but his posterity had been crowned with immortality and life. Indeed what kinde of life and blessedness it would have been is controverted, but immortality and blessedness in the general it concluded on by all. Now *Adams* posterity could not be made partakers of righteousness and blessedness by meer natural propagation, there must be a Covenant necessarily presupposed to make this good; and it was at the meer good pleasure of God, whether he would convey such glorious privileges or no. So that the Covenant God made with *Adam*, is that which takes all his posterity with him, and makes, as *Austin* said, *Omnes homines ille unus homo*, all men that one man: And therefore it's observed that *Adam* is used both for *Eve* and *Adam* also, as being collectively all mankinde. Now if we come to speak of Christ, and our being made righteous by him, it will hold more strongly that his obedience must be ours by imputation, for he is not our natural root as *Adam* was to mankinde; what Christ did for us cannot become ours but by a Covenant and agreement, therefore some are made righteous by it, and not others; so that as by his passive obedience we are made righteous by imputation, and by a Covenant, thus it is also by his active obedience. And thus I have at last vindicated this first Argument, taken from the collation and comparison with the first and second *Adam*, from the many Objections I have any where read or observed against it.

II. Arguments from *Mat.* 5. 17, 18. *Rom.* 8. 3.

A second Argument to prove the imputation of Christs active obedience unto us, shall be from *those several texts, which say, Christ either came to fulfill the Law, or that by him the righteousness of the Law was fulfilled in us, that Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness: That he was made under the Law to redeem us.* These texts will strongly evince That Christs active obedience and fulfilling the Law was for us, as well as the satisfying the penalty of it. Let us take the texts in order: The first is *Mat.* 5. 17, 18. *I am come not to destroy the Law but to fulfill it,* πληρῶσαι, *Beza* makes it a metaphor from untying bonds and loosing them, because the Law is a bond to duty. *Piscator* makes it a metaphor from a building, if you loosen the foundation, the whole fabrick will fall.

Which

Which waies soever you take it, this is plain that Christ came not to destroy or overthrow the Law, but to fulfill it: To see the force of this text, consider

1. That its undeniable by the Law, is meant chiefly, if not solely, the moral Law. So that whereas in other places, the evasion commonly is, that Christ fulfilled the ceremonial Law, because they were shadows, and he the body: This cannot be so here, for he doth plainly instance in the moral Law, at the 21. *verse*, and so along the Chapter: Its true, he saith, he came not to destroy the Prophets neither, but to fulfill them also, and that is, because whatsoever they had prophesied concerning him did come to pass: But this doth not weaken, yea it rather confirmeth, that as he fulfilled the Prophets every way they could be fulfilled; so he did also the Law every way that could be fulfilled.

2. There may be a twofold fulfilling of the Law, meant in this expression. 1. A doctrinal fulfilling of it, by giving the true and pure meaning of it, against those corrupt glosses that were put upon it by the Pharisees. 2. A practical and obedientiall fulfilling of it, by a conformity to the command of it: Now Christ did fulfill the Law both waies, by a doctrinal interpretation of it, that is plain in the text; and by obedience, that is easily made good, as part of the sense, to fulfill the Law, as appeareth, *vers.* 19. For when our Saviour had said he came to fulfill the Law, he confirmeth it by two arguments: First, The immutability and perpetuity of the Law. Secondly, The danger and punishment of him, who shall break it, and that is not by false doctrine only but by disobedience: Therefore he saith, *Whosoever shall break one of these commands, and teach men so to do.* So that disobedience is one way of breaking the Law, and corrupt interpretation of it another way. Therefore our Saviour came to fulfill it by his true doctrine, and by his holy life; and this is acknowledged by *Piscator*, who upon this place saith, that Christ fulfilled the Law in himself and in us, in himself by the love of God, and in us, which he maketh true several waies: First, By working faith in us, whereby we lay hold upon Christ, who by his death removed the curse of the Law.

Secondly, By inabling us to obey the Law in some measure: and thirdly, By chastising and afflicting of us when we go astray. But this seemeth not much to the purpose, though there may be some truth in it, for here lieth the Question, *Whether Christ did obedientially fulfill the Law for us or not, or for himself only*; if for us, as the Scripture makes the salvation of his people, the ground of all that he did and suffered, then we have enough for our purpose out of the text. Its true, they distinguish between obeying *pro nobis*, in our stead, and *propter nos*, for our good. Even as the Socinians distinguish between Christs dying for us, and in our stead; but the same reasons which perswade to understand (*for us*) in matter of his death, to be *in stead of us*, will also concerning his *obedience*, as is more to be shewed. Its said likewise, that Christ obeyed the Law for himself, his humane nature being a creature, was by the obligation of the moral Law, bound to love God, and do those acts which are commanded therein, and so being due upon that ground, could not be imputed to us, as his sufferings could not have been made ours, if he had been bound to suffer for himself, but the discussing of this, will be most proper, when this Objection is brought in.

I therefore proceed to a second text, and that is *Rom.* 8. 3. *That the righteousnes of the Law might be fulfilled in us.* Here we see plainly the great end why Christ came into the world, it was to condemn sinne; you have also the occasion of this, it was because the Law was impossible to us, we could not fulfill it, because of the adhering corruptions to us. Lastly, Here is the effect of this condemnation of sinne through Christ, *That the righteousnesse of the Law might be fulfilled in us.* The δικαίωμα τῦ νόμυ: Many thoughts there are about the sense or meaning of the word δικαίωμα: I willingly go along with those that render it the *Jus*, the *right* and *power* of the Law, that which the Law might require at our hands. This is fulfilled in us, so that whatsoever the Law could demand, that through Christ is accomplished in us. Now the right of the Law was in requiring two things: First, Satisfaction to the penalty of it, for that be ing broken there cannot be any

hope

hope till the justice of God be satisfied. But that is not all: Secondly, The right of the Law is to require perfect obedience, without which we cannot inherit life, and both these must be done for us in and by Christ; so that this δικαίωμα was fulfilled in us, by Christs sufferings, and by his obedience. Its true some understand this of sanctification, because it followeth, *Who walk not after the flesh but the spirit*; but as the Apostle at the 5th *verse* brought this expression as a qualification of those who had no condemnation, so he seemeth in this verse to make it in those, who have the righteousness of the Law fulfilled in them; & if it were to be understood of sanctification, it would not be so properly spoken in the passive sense, for so we do rather fulfill the Law actively, though imperfectly, rather then have it fulfilled passively in us: I wonder therefore at *Gomarus*, an eminent and learned Author, with great assurance & diligence propugning Christs active obedience, that he should in his analytical Expositions on this place, quit this Interpretation, and understand it of sanctification: His reason is no waies cogent, Because (saith he) the text saith, this righteousness is fulfilled in us, and not in Christ; but it is acknowledged by the Opponents, that the satisfaction of the penalty of the Law, is part of this δικαίωμα, which is also accomplished by Christ and in Christ for us; yet in the text its not said to be fulfilled in Christ. Therefore its enough that the Apostle had in the verse before, mentioned the end of Christs coming into the flesh, and so in and through that we come to have the righteousness of the Law fulfilled in us: Certainly the patient and willing suffering of the punishment of the Law, cannot be said to be all the righteousness the Law requireth.

SERM. XXXVI.

More Reasons to prove the Imputation of Christs Active Obedience to Believers.

ROM. 5. 19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

THE third and fourth verses of the eighth Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*, have been brought into establish this truth, *That Christs obedience to the whole Law of God is made righteousness to us.* The righteousness of the Law by Christ, is fulfilled, though not by us, yet in us. I have not observed any considerable Replies to this Objection, but what I meet with shall be Animadverted upon. Two things are said to this Text.

Answ. First, *That it would not be any rational inference, from Christs condemning sinne in the flesh, to conclude, that his perfect obedience is made ours, but rather the clean contrary, for if sinne be taken away, what need we have a righteousness imputed unto us.*

Reply. But this is no strong Answer, for we grant indeed that in the third verse, Christ is there said to condemn sinne, and that by oblation of himself as a sacrifice, for so that περὶ ἁμαρτίας is to be rendred, as *Ludovic. de Dieu* doth excellently clear that place, which hath so tortured Interpreters; he well

well sheweth that the Septuagint use the phrase ἁμαρτιας for a distinct kinde of sacrifice to the Holocaustia, as appears, Levit. 5. 7. and so it is used by the Apostle, Heb. 10. 6, 8. *Burnt offerings and sacrifices for sinne thou hast no pleasure in.* It's true then that the Apostle speaketh of Christs offering himself a sacrifice and an atonement for sinne, and this admirable benefit doth hereby accrew to the Believer, that sinne is condemned; he speaks of it as a person that now is disabled from accusing or laying any thing to our charge, sinne cannot accuse us any longer: Oh glorious privilege, sinne that did condemn all others, is now condemned it self. We say a condemned person in Law cannot give in any witness, how wonderfully may faith improve this to quiet and comfort the conscience: Doth sinne accuse thee, doth that threaten condemnation to thee? say, Christ hath condemned it, that now it hath no more power to accuse: and as if this were not enough (as indeed it is not) there is a second benefit, *that the righteousnes of the Law is fulfilled in us* by this means. Christ did not only by his sufferings remove the curse, but by his absolute conformity to the command of the Law, hath obtained for us a perfect obedience, *so that the righteousnesse of the Law is fulfilled in us.* This followeth most genuinely, yea and necessarily; for the righteousnesse of the Law could not be fulfilled in us, unlesse we had either by inherency or imputation, a perfect obedience made ours. Seeing therefore the Law cannot of it self allow or approve of any thing, but what is perfect, this cannot be said to be fulfilled, unlesse there be an absolute and full conformity to it. So that by Christ, the Law which was our enemy, is now reconciled to us; and that which did once curse us, cannot but blesse and approve of us, because it cannot reject but approve the obedience of Christ.

A second Reply is made, *That by fulfilling should be meant the accomplishment of such a righteousnesse, as the Law had foretold, and so to be parallel with that place where the Law is said to give witnesse of this righteousnesse, Rom. 3. and so it is said, this is the most proper sense of those and other Scriptures for*

the accomplishment or full manifestation of any thing that was under a promise or prediction.

But this will appear easily to be a meer evasion; for when the word is used to fulfill, in that sense there is added ἐν ἐμοὶ γραφὴ, ἐν ὑμῖν πεπλήρωται, and the like: now here is no such thing here, but it is like the expression *Rom.* 13. 8. *He that loveth πεπλήρωκε, hath fulfilled the Law.* And *Gal.* 5. 14. *The Law πεπλήρωται is fulfilled in one word*: Even as *Romans* 13. 10. *Love is said to be πλήρωμα the fulfilling of the Law.*

A third Text is, *Rom.* 10. 3. where *Christ* is said to be *the end of the Law for righteousnesse to him that believeth.* Did not men obscure the Text with Interpretations, and so put a vail on it, the light of it would easily appear to this purpose; That whereas the Law had this for an end, to bring men to perfect obedience, and so to obtain Justification thereby, this through mans corruption being made impossible, yet through Christ the end of the Law is established, and so the Law is not destroyed, nor the intent of the Law-giver frustrated, for Christ is the end of it to him that believeth, and that for righteousnesse.

I shall not insist long on this, because I have some where else handled this. It is true, some understand this of the Ceremonial Law, and so make Christ the end abolishing not accomplishing, the *finis interficiens*, not *perficiens*, the *finis vorsimens*, not *consummans*; but seeing the Apostle argueth against the Jews, *who sought to establish their own righteousnesse by the Law*, we must take it in as large a sense as they did and they thought by all the works they did to any kinde of Law God had commanded to be justified thereby. For although the dispute about Justification began at first by the ceremonial Rites, yet afterwards it extended to all the works of the Law, as plainly appeareth by *Pauls* arguments. Therefore the Apostle at the 5th verse describeth the righteousnesse of the Law, by doing those things, and so a man shall live; now they were not bound to do the things of the ceremonial Law only, but the moral Law also.

Again, If this were to be understood of the ceremonial

Law

Law only, that Christ came to abolish that *Mosaical* administration, and so was the end of righteousnesse in that respect, then it would follow, That Christ was onely righteousnesse in this sense to the believing *Jew*, not to the *Gentile*; for the believing *Gentile* was not bound to that ceremonial Law, neither did Christ abolish it as to them, seeing they were never under it. Certainly by this means, all we that are believers of the *Gentiles* can have no comfort in Christs being the end of the Law for righteousnesse. But see the Apostle speaking universally, *Christ is the end of the Law for righteousnesse to him that believeth.*

Some understand this of the moral Law, and say, Christ was the end of it, because the Law did convince of sinne, and shew us our impotency, and so drive us to seek unto Christ, but this is a secondary use of the Law, and by accident merely, otherwise the Law would have been the Ministry of life as well as the Gospel. The primary use of the Law, and that which is intended *per se*, is to bring unto a perfect and compleat obedience. Look then on Christ, not only as the end of the ceremonial, but also the moral Law, and what obedience thereunto is defective in thee, see it compleated in Christ.

The last Text under this second kinde of Argument alledged for the imputation of Christs active obedience, shall be that famous and notable one, *Galat.* 4. 4, 5. where *Christ* is said *to be made under the Law, that he might redeem us from the curse of the Law; He was made under the Law*, both in respect of the mandatory part of it, and also the comminatory part of it. The Apostle doth there describe his being *made of a woman, and made under the Law*, to be the ground of our redemption from the curse of it.

Answ. If it be said, *Christ was under the obedimential part of the Law for himself, and not for us.*

Reply. That is to be discussed in answering that Objection wherein the Adversary puts so much confidence. *Piscator* would render γενόμενον, *born under the Law*, but if that be granted, it would not much avail him, for still *he was under the Law*; but that must not be granted, for his birth is expressed in,

that, when he is said *to be made of a woman*. That which hath the greater colour is, That to be under the Law, doth imply to be under the curse of it, not the obedience, as when the godly are said not to be under the Law, but under grace: So that by this interpretation, it will reach onely to Christs death, as *Gal.3.13.* but the phrase is not to be thus straightned, for we must take it in the same sense, as the Jews urged it, against whom the Apostle manageth this Epistle. Now when they desired to be under the Law, none can say, they intended to be under the condemning power and curse of the Law only. *Tell me* (saith the Apostle at *vers.21.*) *ye that desire to be under the Law*; certainly they did not desire to be under the curse of the Law: Therefore the Apostle would take them off from seeking Justification by the works of any Law, and look wholly upon Christ, as both obeying and suffering for them. And thus we have ended those Texts that are brought under one head for a second Argument.

III. Argument from such texts as make us to be righteous in Christ, and not in our selves, 2 *Cor.* 5.21.

We proceed to a third, *and that shall consist of such Texts as make us to be righteous in Christ, and not in our selves, to be accepted of in him, to be complete in him, and that we are to be found in him*. All which do teach us thus much, That our righteousnesse is of and in Christ. *It is what he hath done for us, and not what we our selves do*; and its good to adhere to these, because hereby Christ will be the more exalted.

The first Text is, 2 *Cor.* 5.21. *He who knew no sinne, is made sinne for us, that we may be the righteousnesse of God in him*. I have discussed this Text already, when I proved an imputed righteousnesse: Therefore briefly take notice of these three things in the verse.

1. *We are made the righteousnesse of God*, all believers are distributively made the righteousnesse of God, that is, not onely the righteousnesse which God hath procured, or which is accepted of by God, but a righteousnesse that is not a meer mans, therefore its said *in him*, who was both God and man, otherwise it might have been a righteousnesse of God in us.

2. Its said, *A righteousnesse of God in him*, to denote, That though it be ours by imputation, yet its subjectively in him.

him. Not that this righteousnesse, as it is in him, is made ours, so that we should have the righteousnesse of a Mediator, and an infinite righteousnesse, but so farre as we stood in need of it; Of which more in the Objections: Its then our righteousnesse by imputation, but in Christ, not in our selves. And

3. Consider the comparison, *We are made the righteousnesse of God in Christ, as he was made sinne for us.* Not indeed in every respect; for in several particulars there is a dissimilitude, but as to the matter intended by the Apostle, which is to shew, that as our sinnes laid on him, made him die, and endure the wrath of God, when yet he had no sinnes of his own; so his righteousnesse is made ours, when we had not that of our own which could answer the Law. But because I have spoken of this already? I proceed to a second, and that is,

Ephes. v. 6. He hath made us accepted of in the beloved. To be accepted of, implieth the end for which, and that is to eternal life, yea and for the present our persons and duties are also accepted of, but it is still in him. Now, seeing God is so holy and righteous that nothing can be accepted of with him to such eternal glory, but what is compleatly holy, therefore that supposeth our acceptation to be grounded upon his obedience. And thus that known comparison of our appearance in Christs righteousnesse, as *Jacob* did in his elder brothers cloaths, doth suppose, that we are covered with Christs righteousnesse, as with a garment. To have sinne pardoned by the passive obedience of Christ, is but a limited and restrained acceptation, *viz. quoad hoc*, so farre as not to incurre eternal judgement; but this Text speaks of an universall acceptation, even so to be received into the favour of God, as thereby to partake of all the glorious priviledges God hath promised in his Word. This Text will more confirm it, if you joyn *Col.* 2. 10. where believers are said *to be compleat in him, as in Christ their head.* Thus as in him we are risen, as in him we sit in heavenly places; so in him we satisfie the justice of God, and in him we fulfill the Law. By vertue of this mystical union all that Christ hath is made ours, and

what he did we are accounted of as to do it. Therefore the Church is called Christ, because of the intimate communion with him, 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. Christ and believers make one mystical person, as what the natural or political head doth in that relation, all the proportionable members are said to do. Therefore *Aquinas* said truly, *Opera Christi habent se ad membra, sicut opera hominis constituti in gratia ad seipsum.* If a man be holy, then his handes, his eyes, his minde, his will and affections are holy. Thus what Christ did as our head, is imputatively ours; for in these things he was a publique person, and acted in our behalf, not that he repented for us, and believed with a justifying faith for us, as some have fondly imagined; for these things, though graces in themselves, yet necessarly argue some imperfection in the subject where they are.

To these Texts we may adde the practical and experimental way which *Paul* took for comfort, when he would set himself before Gods Tribunal, and that is *Phil.* 3. 9. *To be found in him, not having his own righteousnesse, but the righteousnesse which is of God by faith.* *To be found in him,* that doth notably imply, when the Law and Justice of God shall make enquiry after *Paul,* he would not, though so great an Apostle, and one who had laboured more then them all, yet he would not be found in himself. And certainly thus it is, as *Contarenus* an ingenuous Papist in this controversie hath well observed, The more grace and holinesse any man have attained unto, the more humble and modest they are in themselves, and the higher esteem they have of the imputed righteousnesse of Christ. Not but that they indeed grow more godly, onely hereby they see their own fallings more, and the greater necessity of Christ, they are pleased in themselves lesse, and are more contented and satisfied in Christ. He that lived for them, and he that dieth for them, Christ is *all in all.* Neither do they divide and separate Christs life and his death, but by faith receive whole Christ in all that he undertook for them.

IV. A fourth *Argument* is taken from such places where Christ is expressly called our righteousnesse, and is said to be made of

God

our righteousnesse, Jerem. 23. 6. Jer. 33. 16. 1 Cor. 1. 30. and which is very remarkable, he is said *to bring in an everlasting righteousnesse*, Dan. 9. 24. All these places are very emphatical, and not easily to be put by as some think they may. For the first

Arguments from such Scriptures where Christ is expressly called our righteousnesse, *Jer.* 23. 6. & 33. 16, 1 *Cor.* 1. 30.

Jer. 23. 6. it is plain at the 5th verse, that he whose name shall be called *the Lord our righteousnesse* is Christ, and that he doth not speak of God the Father for us at the 5th *verse*, he describeth his humane nature; so in this 6th he declareth his Divine Nature, he is called *Jehovah*, which is never directly and properly attributed unto any creature, as the Orthodox prove against *Socinians*.

2. As his two Natures are described, so also his Mediatory Office in that attribute, *our righteousnesse*; this is the righteousnesse of the Gospel, and that which Christ is made to us.

3. There is the believers thankfull acknowledgement and profession of it, *He shall be called*. To be called doth signifie not only the being of a thing, but the famous publishing and notifying of it: Every believer shall know where his strength lieth, where his comfort and righteousnesse is treasured up, and that is in Christ, who is both the *Binnah* and the *Jehovah*; This is most genuine, if we do regard the scope of the Prophet, and is received by the current of Interpreters, yet *Grotius* upon the place, applieth it to *Judah*, and not to Christ, as if the sense were, The name that *Judah* shall be called by is, and by righteousnesse doth mean (as sometimes the word is) beneficence and mercy, but every one may see this is to compell Scripture to go whether it would not.

The second Text is almost like this, if not the same, *Jerem.* 33. 16. *This is the name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our righteousnesse.* *Grotius* thinketh this will confirm his interpretation of the former, for here, saith he, the city shall be called thus, and there the people of *Judah*, there is the Masculine Gender, here is the Feminine, but suppose it should be granted, that the right interpretation is, *she shall be called* (as our Translators do) yet *Lapide*'s observation upon the place,

place would much confirm the truth we contend for. That such is the union between Christ and the Church, that there is a communion unto it of all the good things Christ hath; and 1 *Corinthians* 30. *He are said* (that is the Church) *to be the righteousnesse of God in Christ*: Even as Christ maketh the persecution of the Church to reach to him, *Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?* Thus *Paul* on the other side, *Galat.* 2. 20. *I no longer live, but Christ in me.* If then Christ be the Lord our righteousnesse, and this title is given her, for the near communion she hath with Christ who is her righteousnesse, then this doth greatly make for the imputation of Christs righteousnesse unto us. But that translation which *Junius* gives seemeth to be more consonant to the former place, and so makes both this and that alike, which is thus, *And he that shall call her, is the Lord our righteousnesse*: So that Christ the righteousnesse of the Church is here said to call his people to him.

The third Text confirming this, is 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. *We are of Christ, who is made of God to us, righteousnesse*; Here you see *He is righteousnesse, He is made righteousnesse, and he is made righteousnesse of God*, and that to *us*, his righteousnesse was not for himself, but for us, and he is made it to us. To these places the Adversaries of imputation in the sense stated, though differing amongst themselves, yet all agree to give this answer, That Christ is made our righteousnesse causally and effectively, that is, he is the Author and cause of our righteousnesse. Even as God is often called by *David*, his strength, and his hope, yea and so Christ likewise is called, there being nothing so ordinary (say they) as to denominate an efficient with that title, which is effected or wrought by him: and indeed its granted. That this answer might prevail, if the Scripture did not in other places manifest a nearer union between Christ and his people, then of a meer bare efficient; Christ is not onely made the cause of believers graces, but they are said *to be in him*, and *to be made one with him*, and he is their Surety and Mediator, which doth imply a nearer union, then a meer outward cause. Therefore I subjoyned these Texts to the former Argu-

ment

ment of Christs Union with his people, that so the strength of them may be supported: And indeed the very phrase to be *made righteousnesse* being distinct from that of being made Sanctification, must needs have some other sense then of causality, for that is implied, *to being made Sanctification to us*, that is, the Author of all inherent righteousnesse. Therefore to be made righteousnesse to us, must be of some other righteousnesse then is inherent in us.

I adde onely one Text more, which speaks very strongly to this matter, and that is *Daniel* 9. 24. where it is prophesied, that by the *Messiah* shall be brought in this two-fold benefit; First, An Expiation of sinne. Secondly, An Everlasting Righteousnesse. I shall not spend time to confute *Junius* his Exposition, who understands these two things not as Benefits procured by Christ, but as duties imposed upon the Jews in their conversion, to expiate sinne by repentance, and by faith to lay hold on this righteousnesse which is everlasting. Therefore to passe that by.

Here first we see, That remission of sin is not all the righteousnesse that Christ brings in.

Secondly, That the righteousnesse which a believer hath, is by Christ: So that as its not the beleevers tears that wash away his sinnes, but Christs bloud; so neither is it the beleevers duties or graces, that make him in this sense righteous, but what Christ did for us. Therefore its a righteousnesse that Christ brings in. As there was no remission of sinne, but that which Christ brought in; So no righteousnesse which he doth not also bring in, and this is called everlasting righteousnesse, because though imputed righteousnesse, shall cease in heaven, yet the praise and glory of all shall be in reference to that: Even as Christ, though he will perfectly sanctifie us in Heaven, yet shall not loose the honour and glory of that Mediatorship, which once he accomplished on earth.

The fifth Argument, *is taken from those places which re-*

V.

Argument from those Scriptures that represent Christ in the relation of a Mediator and Surety, & made our peace, not by power but righteousnesse.

present Christ in the relation of a Mediator and a Surety for us, and that he did not come to make our peace with God potentiâ aut potestate, but righteousnesse; As Augustine often saith: if it be disputed about Gods power (you have heard some affirming, to whom yet I cannot give my consent) that God might have forgiven sinne without any satisfaction at all; but suppose he would have sinne pardoned in a way of Justice, and not sole and meer mercy, it was necessary that Christ should die. This we urge for his active obedience also, *Heb.* 7. 22. Christ is there made a Surety. This seemeth to carry more in it then a Saviour or Redeemer; for by this Suretiship he becometh in our stead, and so is to perform for us what we ought to do; *Solomon* giveth great caution against Suretiship amongst men, he that keepeth off from it is sure, and yet there the danger is only in being liable to pecuniary debts and outward misery: But oh the great love and condescension of Christ, who would become Surety for us, so as to die for us, to endure the wrath of God for us, and to fulfill all those acts of obedience in a servile and debased way, as he did! If then we would know whether Christs active obedience be imputed to us, let us consider what we were bound to do, and yet could never be able to perform, and then what it did behove our Surety to do for us.

SERM. XXXVII.

The fore-going Argument prosecuted, and some more added.

ROM. 5. 19.

So by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

THE Argument in hand, to prove the imputation of Christs active obedience, is taken *from the Office and relation Christ hath put himself into for us, and bears to be a Mediator and a Surety.* Christ is called our Mediator often, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. *Heb.* 8. 6. *Heb.* 9. 15. *Heb.* 12. 24. but he is called a *Surety* once only, *Heb.* 7. 22. The *Socinian* cavilleth at the word Mediator, and would not understand thereby *a Mediator of reconciliation by way of atonement, but an Interpreter, or a bare Messenger declaring the will of God;* But the contexts where Christ is so called do evidence more then so, howsoever the word *Surety* that will constringe the Heretique that he cannot evade; For a *Surety* (properly so taken) is one that receiveth the obligation upon himself, when the principal or debtor is not able to pay. (*Vide Sam. Tit. fidejussum.*) So that whatsoever the debt is, that the *Surety* ingaged is bound to perform; Christ then being our *Surety*, all that obligation which lay upon us, is derived to him.

Now first, this is plain, That Christ would fulfill all that righteousnesse which did belong to him; otherwise he would have been an imperfect Surety; for as those who are arrested by God in their own persons, shall not go out of prison till they have paid the last farthing; so neither would the justice of God set Christ at liberty, till every farthing of our debt was discharged. Hence *Matth.* 3. 15. when *John* Baptist refused to baptize Christ, he saith, *Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousnesse. It becometh us*] that is, *John* in his office, and Christ in his office, it behoved Christ in his way to fulfill all that righteousnesse that did belong to a Christ to do, as it doth to any man in his particular relation: Now in the Text we see, that submitting himself to Baptism, it was part of the righteousnesse which he did fulfill, as also to be circumcised, to have an offering for him, as for others; here we may justly wonder, why Christ should be baptized, seeing that Baptism in the proper nature of it, signifieth remission of sinnes, the Seal of which could not belong unto Christ? Many give several reasons of it, which seem to be very remote; That which appeareth to be most genuine is, That Baptism, though it doth in particular seal the pardon of sinne, yet in the general its only *objective* of the favour of God to us, and our communion with him, therefore ordinarily said to be the seal of the Covenant of Grace, and in this signification Christ might well submit to it. But why is it called righteousnesse in Christ to do it? I do not with *Grotius* take righteousnesse here for condecency and fitnesse; but truly and properly righteousnesse, as being the fulfilling of his duty, he being now made man, and so under the Law for us, for although it be πρεπον, yet that doth many times signifie a necessary duty, *Ephes.* 5. 3. 1 *Tim.* 2. 10. and it must be so here, because the Baptism of *John* was instituted by God, and as it was not a meer condecency, but a duty in *John* to administer; so also it was in Christ, who subjected himself to be a member of the Church, and thereby was obliged to be baptized, as others were. Hence *Luk.* 7. 31. the neglect of *Johns* Baptism is called *The rejection of the counsil or command of God.* From this particular then

I ga-

I gather, That whatsoever righteousnesse did lie upon Christ to fulfill, *That it behoved him to do.*

Therefore in the second place, *Let us take notice of what righteousnesse he was obliged unto by being our Surety.* And

1. *That he was bound to make an atonement by his death for us, is acknowledged by all the Orthodox.* Indeed the *Socinian* makes it not only an absurd thing, but abhorrent from all reason, that an innocent man should suffer death for the nocent, and he provoketh to the light of nature, and Heathens in this point. Its true, this is a Question disputed in the civil Law, Whether an innocent man may suffer corporall punishment for another. *Covarruvius* a man of great learning and various reading, doth pithily but shortly handle it. [*Covarr. Variar. resolut. Tom. 2. lib. 2. cap.* 8.] Its confessed by all, That a man though innocent may willingly give himself to suffer for another in pecuniary punishments, and such outward losses. Its also granted, That God may punish those that are innocent at least, not nocent, for the sinnes of those that are nocent. Not to speak of Gods Law, commanding the beast to be killed that was instrumental to wickedness, though the beast was not guilty of sinne. Thus that learned Authour instanceth out of *Budeus*, who hath it out of *Demosthenes*, that even animate and inanimate creatures that had been instrumental to a mans death, were formerly by the *Athenians* indited and condemned by *Dracoes* Laws. Not to speak of this (I say) its plain by Scripture, that God threatens *to visit the sinnes of Parents upon their children, even to the fourth generation.* How this is consistent with *Ezekiel* 18.18,19. is not my work here to examine. Its enough for my purpose, that God saith, *he will punish parents sinnes upon their children*; and we see he did it in *Dathans* and *Abirams* case, as also in the children of *Sodome* and *Gomorrah*, in *Achans* case, and *Sauls* seven sonnes, who were hanged for their fathers wickedness. Neither can it be limited, as some would, that God punisheth parents sinnes upon the children, when they imitate their fathers in their wickedness, for the instances mentioned shew the clean contrary. And besides,

it would not then have been said for their fathers sinnes, but their own. Thus the people of whom *David* said, *These sheep, what have they done?* were punished for *Davids* sinne. Now although even Infants and others that were thus punished, were not absolutely innocent, but had corruption in them, for which they deserved any punishment God should inflict on them; yet as to this particular of their fathers sin they were innocent. So that its granted by all, That God may inflict misery upon him that is innocent, and this must be granted by the *Socinian*, unlesse he will deny Scripture, That Christ, though innocent, yet was greatly afflicted, dying an ignominious and reproachfull death; onely they make Christs sufferings for a lesse matter, then we do; We say, It was to satisfie the justice of God; they onely to confirm his Doctrine, which miracles could have done as well: So that its not our Doctrine but theirs, that makes God put Christ to those bitter agonies, and that needlesly, or for little cause at all.

Being thus cleared by Scripture, what God may do, we need not care what mans reason can object; and indeed it must be granted, That by the civil Law, no man can lawfully that is innocent, submit himself to die in the stead of the nocent; he may suffer losse of money, and such kinde of damages he may sustain, but not to be mutilated in members, or to lose life. Therefore though the stories of Heathens do speak much of such things, yet its hard to justifie them; no, nor that of *Zaleucus*, in putting out one of his eyes, for the reason given by *Casuists* is, because no man is Lord or Master of his own life, or his own members, and therefore cannot by voluntary consent deprive himself of them for another; But this doth not hold in Christs case, for *John* 10. he saith, *He had power right and power to lay down his life*; he was Lord of his life, and so could give it up as an expiatory atonement for us, and therefore being our Surety he was bound unto it. Thus its clear for his passive obedience. And

In the second place, *By the same principles and reasons, its no lesse clear for his active obedience.* Therefore *Grotius* is compelled to acknowledge, *That Christs satisfaction was by the*

it. holy

holy actions he did, as well as by his sufferings, and brings this Text, *By the obedience of one many shall be made righteous.* [*De Satisfac. cap. 6. pag. 97.*] And certainly its no more against reason, That the vertue or obedience of another should be imputed unto us, then his sufferings. Seeing therefore that we had an obligation upon us to bring perfect obedience to the Law, it behoved our Surety to perform it for us; neither can it be rationally imagined, why his impletive obedience of the commands of the law should be more dispensed with then the solutive of the punishment of it. Now the debtor or principall failing, not onely in satisfaction to the punishment, but perfect obedience to the Law, it behoveth our Surety, if he will fulfil all righteousnes, to accomplish both for us, &c as to suffer in our stead, so to obey in our stead: otherw se we take but an half Christ, and he loseth much of his honour, and we much of our comfort. Its therefore our duty to look upon Christ doing as well as suffering, not to oppose or separate these from one another: And certainly as *Bonaventure* said, about the controversie concerning free-will and grace, *Tutius erratur, &c. Its safer to erre (if we must erre) by giving too much to grace, then too little*: So its lesse danger, seeing the Scripture propounds Christ to be such a rich and plentifull Saviour to give too much to him, then too little. We had better be found maintaining this, that Christ did more for us then he did, then affirming him to do lesse for us then he did. Though indeed we are not willingly to run into any errour, for the genuine effect of that cannot be to the praise and honour of God.

In the third place, *To understand better how much Christ is obliged for us as a Surety, its good to take notice, That there passed a kinde of Covenant and agreement between the Father and the Sonne concerning our Redemption.* I do not speak of the Covenant of Grace, which God made with man fallen, I cannot by any means subscribe to their opinion, who hold this was made with Christ, but of a particular Covenant with Christ to be the Mediatour; for thus the Scripture represents the Father stipulating and agreeing with the Sonne, that if he will lay down his life for such and

will

will become their Surety, to make up all the breaches that their sinnes have made, then *he shall see of the travail of his soul, and he shall be satisfied*, Isa. 53. 10, 11. so *Psalm.* 40. 7. Christ is there brought in as a Surety, offering himself for us, and readily accepting of Gods will in this matter. We see then the Father enjoyning or requiring, and the Sonne accepting of this work; and upon this he is called *Gods Servant*, and his *ears* are said to be *opened*. Hence *Isai.* 42. 1, 6. *Behold my servant, whom I uphold, my elect in whom my soul delighteth; I will give thee for a Covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles*; yea this agreement seemeth to be confirmed with an oath, *Heb.* 7. 28. and for this service Christ is required, *Psal.* 2. 8. To *ask of God, and he will give him the Heathen for his inheritance*: So that the Church of God is given Christ, as a reward of that obedience, which he shewed in accepting of the Office of a Surety for us. This stipulation is made by a learned man to be that councel of peace, *Zec.* 6. 13. which is said to be *between the Lord, and the man whose name is the Branch*. Though others by both do understand *Jew* and *Gentile*. And for this agreement it is, that Christ is called the second *Adam*; for as with the first *Adam* God plighted a Covenant concerning him and his posterity, if he did not fall; So also did he indent with Christ and his seed concerning eternal life to be obtained by him. Its true, there are men that speak very contemptibly of both these Covenants, making the former at least, if not the later, to be ridiculous and absurd, as if it were no better then that *Stipulatio de Hippocentauro*, spoken of in the civil Law [*Covar.*] But I suppose such a Covenant hath sufficiently been demonstrated out of the Scriptures.

In the fourth place, *Such an agreement and stipulation being made between the Father and the Sonne, our sinnes are laid upon him, and his obedience and sufferings are made ours; so that in this controversie we are to look upon Christ in the nearest, but spiritual union that can be.* Its not enough to say, Christ is the cause of our righteousnesse, but he is made our righteousnesse, Christ received by faith is the matter of our Evangelical righteousnesse; so that Christ doth otherwise procure

our

our righteousnesse whereby we are justified, then he doth the grace of our inward Vocation and Regeneration, for he is not the matter of that: we cannot say, Christ received by faith is the matter of our Vocation and Regeneration, as we may say he is of our Justification. The Father works holinesse in us, the Spirit worketh holinesse in us, yet we cannot say, These are made righteousnesse to us, whereby we are justified, because neither of them did interpose to be a Surety for us; Hence by reason of this Union, Christ cals the sinnes of those whom he is to redeem, his sinnes, *Psalm* 40. 12. Its Christ that speaks there, though it was also true of *David* as the type in another sense, *Mine iniquities have taken hold on me*; our iniquities are called Christs iniquities; Therefore *Heb.* 9. 28. Christ is there said to come a second time without sinne, implying his first coming was with sinne, not indeed inhering in him, but imputed to him, so that he was to bear them away. Thus his righteousnesse and obedience is made ours, and both his obedience and sufferings were not onely for us, but in our stead he accomplished all, as undertaking our obligation upon him.

Yet in the fifth place, *We must thus understand the communication of Christs obedience to us in those things onely wherein we were obliged.* We cannot say, That many things Christ did, are our obedience, and are imputed to us. The miracles that Christ wrought, though they were for our good, yet they were not imputed to us as our righteousnesse; and the reason is, because we had no obligation upon us to these things, and therefore Christ acted as our Surety in those things onely wherein we were obliged, whatsoever other things he might do as God, or occasionally as man, or as a Mediatour; These things though they had their direct and proper benefit accrewing to us, yet we cannot say, Christ did them as in our stead: Even as with *Adam*, it was not every personal action that he did, that was imputed to us, we did not eat or drink in *Adam*, as we sinned in him, but that onely in which the Covenant consisted. And thus have we finished the *fifth Argument*: we were the larger upon

it, because this is the foundation of all, and all the other Arguments are at last to be reduced to this, this giveth life and strength to all the rest.

V. I. Argument from the perpetuity and immutability of the Law.

The *sixth Argument shall be taken from the perpetuity and immutability of the Law: God will not give eternal life, but upon a* Do this. *This righteousnesse will be for ever required, as the condition of happinesse*, Levit. 18. 5. Ezek. 20. 11. Mat. 5. 18. *and wherein it might be thought by the Apostles Arguments, that he did overthrow the Law, he disclaimeth such inferences*, Rom. 3. 31. *Yea* (saith he) *we establish the Law*, the righteousnes of faith doth not dissolve that. These places prove the immutability of the Law, both in the precepive part of it, it doth and will require perfect obedience, as also in regard of the promise of eternal life: Insomuch that learned and great Authors say, [*Beza, Junius, Perkins.*] That we may claim eternal life, *ex formula fœderis, Hoc fac & vives*, Do this and live; but I see no necessity of granting that, because the Law required it in our persons, and so it is not our doing, but Christs doing for us by which we live: Its the same righteousnesse we and *Adam* in his state of Integrity are justified by, in respect of the nature and substance of it, onely the manner of communication of it is different, in *Adam* it was inherent, in us it is imputed: Therefore the *Leyden* Divines do well observe, [*Synop. puri. Theol. de Justificat.*] That the righteousnesse of faith, or the righteousnesse of the Gospel and the Law, are not absolutely and simply contrary one to another; we are not justified contrary to the Law, onely in respect of us, there is such an opposition, that he who is justified by one cannot be by the other, not that they are two distinct righteousnesses every way, but two opposite wayes of communicating the same righteousnesse, that righteousnesse we formerly had in us, is now in Christ our Surety, and we by faith are made partakers of it; Therefore its wholly a mistake to think, that the Apostle argueth against Justification by works, or righteousnesse by the Law, as fulfilled by Christ for us, for his purpose is to establish it so, onely he bends himself against those that sought for this righteousnesse of the Law in themselves, whether with-

without the grace of God, or with it. The Apostle then doth not absolutely and universally argue against the righteousnesse of the Law, but the endeavouring to finde this in our selves, and not in Christ. And indeed this must be so, because the primary work of Christ our Surety was, to perform that obedience of the Law we were obliged unto; and secondarily to remove our punishment, which was due to us by the transgression of the Law: So that if we consider the stipulation that Christ made with the Father to be our Surety, his active obedience was the main and principal: Even as all Law-givers regard more the obedience of their Laws, then Satisfaction to the penalty; and indeed if we duly consider it, God himself cannot take off the obligation from us, no more then he can cease to be our God and Creator; for obedience is founded necessarily in the subjection of a creature unto its Creator.

A seventh Argument may be *from the typical prefigurations of their active obedience by Christ*. Indeed there is a later Writer [*Forbes*] that useth this Argument the contrary way, *We are not* (saith he) *justified by the Active obedience of Christ, but the Passive onely, because all the legal Types were of that onely*. But I urge on the contrary, There were prefigurative Types of his Active obedience; Therefore that concurreth to our Justification. Although there is no strength in that Argument, to say, Such things were not in Christ, because there was no Type of it; but we need not runne to that in *Exodus* 28. 36, 38. we there reade plainly of the pure gold that was to be on *Aaron*, with this engraven on it, *HOLINESSE TO THE LORD*, and this was, That the children of *Israel* might be accepted of in all their holy things: the pure and excellent Garments of the High Priest, as also his Washings and Purifications did manifest this; yea in the Lamb that was sacrificed there was required, that it should be without spot and blemish, which integrity was considered as part of the Sacrifice, and this the Apostle considereth as part of Christs Sanctified, 1 *Pet.* 1. 19. *The precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot.* The like

Arg. 7.

precious blood of Christ] there is his Passive obedience; *without spot or blemish*] there is his Active. This purity was not a qualification of the Sacrifice, but a constitutive ingredient into it. *To be without blemish*, ἄμωμος, that required no defect in the parts, and ἄμωμος, that required no spot or streaked colour upon it. The incense also that was offered on the Altar, denoted Christs Active obedience, which makes the duties of all the godly accepted, as appeareth *Rev.* 8.3,4.

VII. The *eighth Argument shall be from the object of our justifying Faith, which is the Person of Christ, or whole Christ.* Hence its so often called Faith in him, or in his Name, and beleeving in him; If then whole Christ be the object of our Faith justifying, we are not to look to his sufferings meerly, to his blood or death, nor to his birth or works onely, but to take whole Christ, as the adequate object of our Faith; and certainly, the limiting of our Justification to his Passive obedience, divides Christ, and takes off much from his whole Person as the Mediatour, and rests on part of that righteousnesse which we have by him.

VIII. Lastly, *The Doctrine which holds the imputation of both Obedience active and Passive, tends more to Christs honour and our comfort.* Its true, we must not honour Christ, or take comfort upon feigned opinions of our own; neither may we argue, This (we think) honours Christ, and will bring comfort: Therefore its true; But when we see the scope of the Scripture is to exalt Christ, not in his own Person so much, as our Mediatour, and to commend his love, by how much the more he was debased for us; As also, to comfort us by the proper fulnesse that is in him, for every want and temptation we have, then finding many particular Texts subservient to that generall scope, we may with the more confidence and comfort assert the latitude of all his obedience for us: For the Scripture doth not onely speak of Grace, but riches of Grace, and superabounding Grace by him, and that he became poor that we might be rich; so that they endeavour it, who limit

limit it onely to a Satisfaction of the penalty of the Law, and will not admit an obediential righteousnesse to the commands of it. Certainly, the temptation of a godly man doth not onely lie about the pardon of his sinne, but the defect and imperfection of his obedience. Therefore *Beza* (in his *Confessio Fidei, cap.*28.) amongst other strong temptations of Satan, whereby he assaults the godly, makes this one, That we have not in us the righteousnesse which God justly requireth of us. Its not enough to have satisfied for sinne, but God also requireth perfect obedience. Now in this temptation, he directs the believer to the other treasure of Christ, beside Satisfaction, which is his most absolute and perfect righteousnesse, which by Faith applied, we are in Christ accepted of, as co-heirs with him. Hence also he saith, *Pag.* 63. The Law and the Gospel differ not in respect of that righteousnesse we are to be cloathed with, if we would have eternal life, but only in the manner of participation of it.

Sect. 3. Arg. 1. Some of which seem to have great colour of reason and strength with them. And the first shall be this: they judge [illegible] and the scope of these Scriptures. A[illegible] and these.

The contrary Arguments examined.

1.

SERM. XXXVIII.

Arguments against the Imputation of Christs Active Obedience, answered.

Rom. 5. 19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made Righteous.

IT is *Lactantius* his Observation, *That erroneous persons do usually set themselves* destruere aliena, *rather then* astruere propria, *to overthrow other mens opinions rather then establish their own.* And thus indeed the *Socinians* are remarkable herein, whose greatest work in all their writings is to destroy and demolish what the Orthodox have built, little attending to establish their own Doctrines. Seeing therefore the more noble and worthy part hath been dispatched by us, *viz.* the argumentative asserting of Christs Active Obedience, as well as his Passive, as to our Evangelical righteousnesse; Its our work in the next place, to consider and weigh the contrary Arguments, some of which seem to have great colour of reason and strength with them. And the first shall be that which they judge palmarious, and the chiefest of their Scripture-Arguments, and that is,

The contrary Arguments examined. I.

The Scripture attributing our Justification every where to the blood of Christ, it makes our redemption to be by his death onely. So *Piscator* argueth, (2. *Vol. Thes. de Justif.*) The Scripture attri-

attributeth our remission of sinne and salvation, onely to Christs death, therefore onely by it are we justified. To this we may reduce *Forbes* his Argument, concerning the Sacraments of Baptism, and especially of the Lords Supper, that they represent onely the passive obedience of Christ, and these being in their Institution the seals of the righteousnesse of faith, must necessarily inferre, that our righteousnesse is only by Christs sufferings.

Now although we have formerly answered sufficiently to this, as it was an Argument brought to limit the obedience mentioned in the Text, only to passive obedience, yet something more is to be replied to it, because they put so much confidence in it. And *Answ.*

First, They put the word *Sola* in the Argument, which the Scripture doth not; They say, by Christs passive obedience alone, but the Scripture useth no such limiting or exclusive particle. If our Protestant Writers had not upon better ground said, *Solâ fide*, by faith alone we are justified, they would have been justly obnoxious to the Popish censure. When therefore the Scripture doth so often mention Christs death, this is not to be understood exclusively to his antecedaneous obedience, but synecdochically, by a chief part of it intending the whole; for as we formerly shewed, the Scripture attributes it sometimes to other things, especially *Phil.* 2. there is the whole course of his obedience from his birth to his death, mentioned as the ground of our salvation; and to these former places, I shall adde all such Texts, as make the whole person, even Christ himself the ground of our reconciliation, not restraining the person to his sufferings, but making the whole person to be the matter or object of our acceptance with God, *Rom.* 3.25. *Whom God set forth to be a propitiation.* So 2 *Corinth.* 5. *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, and Christ was made sinne for us.* John 1. *As many as received him*; and in many places, Christ speaks of himself in his whole person, that he is *life*, that he is *the bread of life, That he who believeth in him shall never die*: So that to speak properly, not the death of Christ, but Christ himself is the object of our Justification; Neither are we

to

to seek in either in his active or in his passive obedience by dividing or distinguishing of them, but in Christ himself.

Secondly, Even the Adversaries must acknowledge from their own principles, that by death we are to mean other things besides that, for otherwise his sufferings before in the Garden would be excluded, wherein Christ seemed to be more afflicted then in death it self, as also the sufferings of his soul under the sense of Gods anger, which yet many of the opponents acknowledge: yea there are those that confesse all the servile acts of Christs obedience to be part of his satisfactory righteousnesse; and if death be not understood synecdochically, they must be all excluded; it is therefore of necessity that we must look upon Christs death, not as oppositely to his former acts of obedience, but because this was the ultimate and most signal expression of it, therefore doth the Scripture so often mention it.

And as for the Sacrament, though they may visibly in a more peculiar manner represent Christ as suffering for us, yet most Divines say, That our communion seated in them, is not properly with those actions of Christ, but Christ himself. So that in every Sacrament, its Christ himself we put on, and its Christ himself that we are more ingrafted into: Hence *John* 3.14, 15. Christ dying on the Crosse is resembled to the Serpent lifted up, *and whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life.* Thus the eating of his flesh and drinking of his bloud sacramentally, is nothing but believing in him, and receiving whole Christ primarily, and all his benefits flowing from him by consequence. Its therefore a great mistake to oppose Christs death to his active obedience; for Christs sufferings, meerly as so, do not make an atonement for us, but as they were the effects of his obedience, and of his love to God and man; Therefore we are to look on Christs death, as an obediential act, which was the consummation of all his former obedience, yea if we thoroughly search to the root of the matter, it was not so much his external sufferings, as the inward promptitude of his will to die for us, that was meritorious, and this will he had as

soon

soon as he came into the world. Therefore that very place so much insisted on by the opponents, is a pregnant instance against them, *Heb.*10.10. *By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus once for all*; because that [*once*] is not spoken determinatively, as if then, and onely then our consummation of happinesse was attained, but its expressed oppositely to the frequent repetition of the Sacrifices in the Old Testament: and that we are not to restrain this blessednesse of ours to the time of his death, appeareth *vers.*5. *Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared for me——Lo I come to do thy will (O God.)* By this its plain we are not to look so much to Christs death, as his will to die, for that external act had no merit in it, simply as so, without Christs will; and Christs will is not to be considered as immediate before his death, but as soon as ever he came into the world. And although we are not curiously to enquire when began the time of Christs meriting for us, yet we see by that expression (when he cometh into the world, even then it is, *to do thy will, O God*) that this must needs be very early, and by this will which he had as soon as he came into the world, we are said to be sanctified; and therefore as *Suarez* (though a Jesuite) yet speaks more soundly in this particular, then many others who pretend to greater Orthodoxy, when out of *Aquinas* he sheweth, That by the Covenant and appointment of God its brought about, that the whole life of Christ should be ordained for the obtaining of a full right, as it were of one merit to be consummated in his death. (*Suarez De Christo Quæst.* 19. *Disp.* 39.) So that our proper duty is not to divide his active or passive obedience, or to attribute his holinesse to one end, and his sufferings to another, but to look upon his whole life and death, as that full and integrall righteousnesse, whereby we stand justified before God. And thus much for the first Objection.

The second Argument brought against the imputation of Christs active obedience in the sense controverted, is taken *from the debt and obligation that lay upon Christ in respect of his* II. *Argum.*

humane nature to obey the Moral Law of God. From whence they argue, *That which Christ was bound to do for himself, that cannot be imputed to us for our righteousnesse, but Christ in respect of his humane nature was bound to obey the Moral Law for himself: Therefore it cannot be imputed to us. Even* (say they) *as if Christ had been bound to suffer for himself, his sufferings could not have been a Propitiatory Atonement for us. This is one of the principal Arguments insisted on: Christ as a man, and as a member of the Jewish Church was obliged to an actual conformity in obedience to them, and therefore it was not for us, but himself, that he did so obey.*

Answ. This Argument deserveth a large discussion, for a great part of the cause will be gained if this be cleared. And

1. There are Divines of very great name, that do wholly deny that Christ was bound to the Moral Law, because though his humane Nature was a creature, yet because the personal subsistence of it was Divine, and Laws being given not to Natures, but to Persons, therefore it was that he was not bound to obey any Law; and indeed it must be acknowledged, that the whole order of nature was inverted in Christ: Every thing in him was a miracle, he was a Lord of the Law, and yet obedient to it, he was both a *Viator* and a *Comprehensor*: so that its no wonder if those things which are easily granted of pure meer men be denied of Christ, who though man, yet had a Divine Subsistency. But whether this hypostatical Union did absolutely free him from an obligation to the Moral Law, I much doubt, for still his humane nature did abide a creature, and the will of a creature cannot be the supream Law, therfore it had an obligation upon it, and if this be not so, it will be hard to say, how Christ could obey, for *actiones* are *suppositorum* also, actions are of persons properly, and not of natures, and so by this means we shall make it impossible for Christ to be our Redeemer and Surety. We must therefore necessarily conclude that Christ was obliged to keep the Moral Law, not indeed as God, nor in respect of his personal Subsistence, but as man; For its an undeniable Rule, amongst the learned, *that what doth belong to either of the Natures of Christ, is yet attributed to the whole*

person,

person, by κοινωνία ἰδιωμάτων, the communication of properties: So that as Christ himself said of himself, while on earth, *John* 3. 13. *That the Sonne of man is in Heaven*; and *Acts* 20. 28. God is said *to purchase the Church by his own blood*, which expressions are true by the communication of properties: So also its true, when we say, Christ was bound to keep the Moral Law, that is, in respect of his humane Nature: Neither is it necessary to put in that limitation alwayes (as a man) in our speeches, for we see the Scripture speaking so often of Christ, without limiting either to his humane or divine Nature, because common reason will make us apprehend, in respect of which nature it is, that such a thing is affirmed of him; Therefore let us grant, that Christ as man was bound to obey a Law.

In the next place, *Let us consider what Law he was obliged unto.* And

1. *There is that which is called by some, the Eternal Law, or Law of Nature, whereby things intrinsecally good are commanded, and intrinsecally evil are prohibited; such are, to love God, not to lie,* &c. Now even to this Law say some eminent Divines, Christ was not bound, because the hypostatical Union did exempt him, for this they think as absurd, as if a man should say, Christ was subject to himself, or Christ was bound to obey himself. Therefore though they will grant, That Christ could not lie, could not but love God, yet this did not arise from an obligation of any Law he was under, but from the perfection of his Nature: Even as God himself cannot sinne, not because he is under a Law, seeing his Will is the Rule of all goodnesse, but because of the infinite holinesse which is in him. But I cannot subscribe to this, because (as was said before) the personal Union doth not exempt the humane Nature of Christ from being a creature, neither doth he cease to be man; And therefore seeing his humane Will was not the supream Rule of holinesse, its necessary it should be conformed to that which was supream: Hence he said, *Not my will, but thine be done*; and although it be true, that its the person that is the principle of actions, and to whom Laws are made, yet mediately they extend to Natures also.

The perſon or *ſuppoſitum* is the *principium quod*, the principle that doth act, but the Natures in Chriſt, are the *principium quo*, the principle by which the perſon doth work: So that I ſhall not deny, but that Chriſt as a man was obliged to this Law, yet there is no conſequence at all, that therefore this obedience of his may not be imputed to us.

In the next place, there is the civil or political Law, under which I comprehend the command of obedience to parents, though that alſo may be called natural, and ſo it is in reſpect of meer man, but I think it was poſitive onely in reſpect of Chriſt; and here the Queſtion is, Whether Chriſt was bound to obey theſe Laws? Onely take notice (as is more to be ſhewed) that an obligation may ariſe two wayes:

Queſt.

Anſw.

1. From the nature of the thing antecedently to a mans conſent.

2. From ſuppoſition only, ſuppoſing a former conſent to ſuch and ſuch a condition, then he having ingaged thereunto, by that means he hath induced an obligation upon himſelf, as between man and man: Though a friend be not bound to be Surety for another, or to pay his debts, yet if once he hath undertaken it, then he is obliged, not from any intrinſecal cauſe, but by an extrinſecal ſuppoſition.

To apply this to our purpoſe, when we queſtion, Whether Chriſt was bound to obey the mentioned Laws? We ſpeak not of an obligation by ſuppoſition; for when he had once voluntarily made himſelf under ſuch a Law, then he was bound thereby; but of an intrinſecal obligation ariſing from the nature of the thing, Whether Chriſt was bound to obey his Parents, or the civil Magiſtrate, as other men are? or, Whether the obedience he did ſhew was onely voluntary, and for our example, and concerning his ſubjection to his Mother *Mary*? Certainly, even in that Law of honouring Parents there was a great difference between Chriſt and a meer man; Therefore we reade, when his Mother (*Joh* 3. 3.) told him, *they had no wine*, that Jeſus ſaid to her, *Woman* (not mother) *What have I to do with thee? my hour is not yet come:* So again, *Luke* 2. 48. when his mother ſaid, *Sonne, Why haſt thou thus dealt with us? Behold thy father and I have ſought*

ſought thee ſorrowing: he ſaid unto them, *Wiſt ye not that I muſt be about my Fathers buſineſſe?* Theſe expreſſions do argue ſome independency in Chriſt, more then in a meer naturall ſonne; for although *Levi* is commended for not knowing father and mother; yet in Chriſts cauſe *we are to hate father and mother*, yet our Saviour ſeemeth to inſinuate more in himſelf then this. Its true, its ſaid at the 51. verſe, *that Chriſt went down with his parents to Nazareth, and was ſubject to them*; but the ground is not ſet down whether it was a voluntary ſubjection, or neceſſary from a natural obligation. Certainly, it could not be a natural obligation, as to *Joſeph*, who was his father only, (as it was ſuppoſed) or his legal father amongſt men; and in reſpect of his mother, although he was born of her, and *made of a woman*, in reſpect of his bodily ſubſtance, yet ſeeing her conception was in a miraculous and extraordinary way, we cannot ſay, that ſhe was his mother in ſuch a manner as ordinarily mothers are to their children: This is to ſhew, that though Chriſt was ſubject to his Parents, yet there was not ſuch a natural obligation upon him, as is on meer men, but it was in a great meaſure, though I cannot ſay univerſally voluntary, I ſay univerſally, becauſe ſo farre as ſhe was his true mother, and he her true real Son, ſo far the natural honouring Parents did extend to him. There is no leſſe doubt about the civil Magiſtrate, Whether Chriſt as man was bound to obey him; for when they came to demand Tribute of him, our Saviours Argument ſeemeth to carry it, that he was free, *Matth.* 17. 16. a difficult place it is, that hath occaſioned much debate upon it. Its granted by all, That *quoad factum* and *uſum* did ſubject himſelf to the Magiſtrate, did pay Tribute, did not refuſe to appear before their Judgement, acknowledged *Pilate* had power over him: But the Queſtion is, Whether there was an obligation upon him as he was man to do thus? Or, Was it a meer voluntary privation of the uſe of that right which he had? To this there are ſeveral Anſwers, which ariſe from ſeverall ſprings; for there are thoſe that ſay, Chriſt as man by his lineal deſcent had the true and proper right to the Kingdom of *Judea*, that the Scepter did belong to him, as being the next ſucceſſour,

onely he did voluntarily abstain from the claim and exercise of this right; so that when he was taxed with others, and paid Tribute, this he did, not as bound to it, but relinquishing or suspending his right. But there must be many doubtfull conjectures cleared ere this can be positively asserted. The Popish parasites upon a carnal design to advance the Pope above all civil power, say, That Christ as man had the direct and absolute dominion over all the Kingdoms and Nations of the world, and that by a three-fold title, 1. Of his personal Union. 2. By Merit. 3. By Redemption. So that by this right, Christ, if he would, might have deposed all the powers that then ruled, and have taken their priviledges into his own hand; he had this dominion, they say, *in habitu*, though he did not put it forth *in actu secundo*. But this is contrary to Scripture; for Christ saith, *John* 20. *His Kingdom is not of this world*; neither was such a priviledge any wayes proper or accommodated to his Mediatory Office, howsoever by this opinion Christ was not obliged to obey any civil Magistrate, because all temporal Jurisdiction did belong to him, as a Superiour. In the third place, *Spalato* (*l.* 6. *de Repub. Eccl. cap.* 1.) acknowledged to be a learned man, though in a large Discourse, he is very vehement against such fawning Positions of some Papists, yet affirmeth, That it cannot be said *sine blasphemia haretica*, that Christ as man was subject to the civil power, or that *Cæsar* and *Pilate* had any right over him even as man: The reason he proceedeth upon is, That the right of civil power doth not extend to humanities in the abstract, but to persons, and therefore *Pilate* did not only sin by unjust judgement condemning the innocent, but also by an usurped judgement, exercising jurisdiction over him, who was not over him. Its true, he will not grant *Pilates* judgement was usurped, for he had right upon a lawfull presumption, because *Pilate* was not bound to know that Christ was God, as well as man, or that his humane Nature did subsist in the Divine Person. But this is infirm, for *Pilate* being the Judge, as he was bound to know, Whether Christ was innocent or no, so having the opportunity and means of knowledge, he was bound to have believed in him as the *Messias*,

Not

Not to be too long on this, we may conclude, That Christ did truly subject himself unto civil powers, and was obliged thereunto as man, taking such a servile form upon him, as he did; onely this subjection and obedience was voluntary, in that he was not necessitated, but voluntarily took our nature upon him in such a subjected way for our everlasting good: Even as he voluntarily took a passible body, subject to thirst and weariness, yea pains and death it self for our sakes: So that although he might have been made man, and yet not put himself into such bodily infirmities, or moral subjection and debasement; yet when once he hath thus subjected himself, then there is an obligation upon him.

A further doubt may be made about the positive precepts, which God gave the people of the Jews, to be circumcised, and perform those ceremonial precepts God gave the people of *Israel*; for *Piscator* he saith, Christ was bound to these as being an *Israelite*, and so it was his duty to be circumcised, which accordingly he was in reference to his own obligation. Others that deny the active obedience of Christ in our sense, do grant, that he was not bound to these, but they were part of that Mediatory Law Christ had imposed on him.

SERM.

SERM. XXXIX.

That Christ was truly and properly subject to the Law of God, both general and particular: And that he suffered in obedience both to the natural and positive Law.

ROM. 5.19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

THe Answering of this Question will be of the same affinity with the former. As Christ was not necessitated to be man, so neither to subject himself to that positive obedience; yea though as man he might not have submitted himself unto it: for if this subjection did necessarily follow his humane nature, then still Christ would be bound to such an obedience, for he doth not cease to be a man though glorified in heaven. *This obligation then of Christ in the daies of his flesh to be circumcised, and to observe such positive precepts as were commanded the Jews, did arise because of that voluntary resignation of himself to be made under the Law, which God should give his people, though in respect of his Divine nature he was Lord of that Law.* Hence it was that he did observe the Sabbath, and although he did those things which his adversaries judged to be a breach of the Sabbath, yet he vindicated those

passa

passages, because they were the duties of charity and necessity: Its true, he saith, *The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath*, *Matth.* 12.8. but that may be understood because he who was the Son of man, was also God, and so there is the communication of properties; or else in a general way, that *the Sabbath was made for man*, and therefore in cases of necessity a man was not obliged to such duties, as ordinarily are required. And certainly, that our Saviour was obliged by the Law, as others were, (though also with great dissimilitude) doth appear in that he challengeth his adversaries, *Which of you can accuse me of sinne, and what evil have I done?* Implying, that if he had broken the Law, they might justly have accused him: He doth not at any time plead an exemption from the Law, or that it was made for meer men, but not for him who was God and man, but still acknowledgeth an obligation upon him; and although in paying of tribute he pleaded his freedom, that is, if absolutely considered, if it had pleased him, he might not so have debased himself; yet supposing he would become man in such a way for our redemption, then he did voluntarily take this obligation upon him, which appeareth in that expression to *Peter*, when he yieldeth to pay, that he may give no offence, *Matth.* 17.27. which supposeth that there was an obligation upon Christ as man, not to give just offence or scandal, otherwise if Christ had stood upon his absolute exemption from all Laws, there was no cause to regard the matter of offence. Thus our Saviour, *Matth.* 4.10. when the devil tempted him to such things as were unlawfull, he repels him by such arguments as are taken from those duties that belong to a man. Thus Christ made that command, *Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God*, to belong to him: So *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, Christ appropriates to himself; by which it appeareth that Christ looked upon it as his duty to worship and serve God according to those waies that God had commanded others.

But against this there are Learned men that Object, *Christ* (say they) *could not, no not in respect of his humane nature, be obliged to the positive worship and ceremonial Law of the Jews be-* Object.

cause he was not truly and properly a child of Abraham, *because he was not in the loins of* Abraham, *as other Jews were, even as he was not in* Adam; *therefore though* Adam *was under a common Covenant for himself and his posterity, yet this Law did not bind Christ as it did all mankinde, for then Christ should have sinned in* Adam, *as well as the rest of mankinde. Thus it is also in respect of* Abraham, *seeing he was not contained in* Abraham, *properly, neither was of* Adam, quoad seminalem rationem, *but* corpulentam substantiam: *Therefore it could not be, that those positive precepts should reach to Christ. And further, such precepts are made to those that do imply imperfection in them, for the ceremonial Law did signifie the expiation of sin.*

Now though this be very specious, yet it will not hold:

For 1. its granted even by them that Christ did actually submit himself to the observation of those positive precepts. They grant the *Factum*, but not the *Jus*, the observation, not the obligation. But their Objection will fall on themselves, Why should Christ submit to that, which in the institution of it did denote imperfection and sinne in the subject obliged?

2. Their Arguments prove, that Christ was not obliged to put himself in such a condition that required such subjection, but when once he had resigned himself unto it, then he was bound not indeed properly for himself, but for us, as he was not made man for himself, but for us. Christ being circumcised did thereby make himself a debtor to keep the whole Law, not for himself but for us; Its true those that deny this obligation of Christ, say, that passage of *Pauls, He that is circumcised becomes a debtor to keep the whole Law*, is to be meant only of meer man, not of Christ, who was not seminally in *Abraham*. But first, The Scripture cals Christ, *the seed of Abraham*; he is that seed *in whom all the Nations of the earth are to be blessed*. And secondly, Being a true man, though not in that ordinary propagation, he was thereby a member of the Jewish Church; even as if God had *raised up children to Abraham out of stones*, they would have been *Abrahams* children in the Scriptures sense, though not by natural propagation from him. Christ then being true man, yea and

ejusdem

ejusdem speciei with other men, in respect of his humane nature, he was obliged to such a worship of God, as was then appointed for all men, who should serve him according to his will. Hence it is that *John* 4. he puts himself in the number of the Jewish members, when he saith to the woman of *Samaria* in the plural number, *We worship what we know.* So that it was his duty, as man, to worship God: And therefore we reade so often of his praying unto God, and that with so much fervency; for although he could as God do whatsoever he pleased, as appeareth by his working of miracles, and so needed not to pray any more then God himself, yet as man it was his duty to pray unto God; Prayer being by Divine ordination, the means by which God had decreed to bestow on him that glory he was to partake of: So that as its said, *it behoved him to suffer, and then enter into glory*, Luke 22. thus it behoved him to pray, and so receive that exaltation of his person. Hence *Psal.* 2. its said, *Ask of me, and I will give thee the inheritance of the earth.* He was bound to ask and seek for it by praier at Gods hands; and *John* 17. he doth there make a large prayer, which is for to accomplish and effect all those things either for himself or his Church, that he had merited at Gods hands. By all this it appeareth, that Christ having once subjected himself in this way as he did, there was an obligation upon him to conform himself unto those positive precepts, and that he did observe those commands not meerly for example, but from obligation and duty as he was a man in that debased way.

3. The next and last thing to be debated about the Laws Christ was obedient unto, is, *Whether there was a peculiar Law or Commandment laid upon him to be our redeemer and to die for us.* And to this we have formerly answered, that Christ was truly and strictly under a command, and that what he did was properly and truly called obedience. We shewed many places, wherein Christ himself called it a command, not a meer bare insinuation of Gods will, but a strict command, and indeed otherwise it could not have been obedience, unless *materialiter*, as its said, the glorified Saints in heaven do, to whom properly no command is made; they

Whether Christs obedience was to a peculiar command laid upon him.

being now no longer *viatores*, or travellers to heaven, but at their journeys end; and so *comprehensores* of that Crown of glory laid up for them: So that although they love God and delight in him, yet (say some) this is obedience *materialiter*, not *formaliter*. But that Christs obedience was formally so, appeareth, in that otherwise he could not have merited, neither could he have been our Surety to take our obligation upon him.

Whether Christs obedience to die for us was to a natural or positive command.

This then being granted, there is a further and a more difficult Question arising from the former, *viz. Whether Christs obedience in dying for us, was to a natural or a positive command:* That is, Whether Christ in undertaking our redemption, was bound by a meer voluntary positive precept, such as God made to *Abraham* to offer up his son *Isaac*: or whether it was from that moral Law, to love God with all his heart and soul, and his neighbour as himself. There are Learned men that say, Christ being once made man, he was bound as a man from love to Gods glory, and to his neighbour, to lay down his life for mans salvation: And this they think will hold the more firmly, if we suppose it revealed to the humane nature by the Father, that he will not save man any other way. Then say they, as it is a mans duty in some cases to lay down his bodily life to save the spiritual life of another, and the Apostle saith, *We are to lay down our life for the Brethren*, 1 John 3.16. so it was Christs duty as man, being no other could do it but he, and he was only qualified for it by his debasing of himself both in life and death to procure our salvation. Neither is that thought any considerable Objection, though it be a duty to a meer man, because the salvation of anothers soul is a greater good then the bodily life of another; whereas Christ temporal life being the life of him who was God also, did serve to be more worth then the salvation of all mens souls. This (I say) is not considerable, because Christs life was not absolutely lost, it was only for a little time that his soul and body was separated, though his Deity was not from either of them. Thus these Authours think, that as in some cases the moral Law doth binde to be Martyrs, and to lose our lives for the confession of

of faith, and edification of others; so it was also a command upon Christ, that God having decreed to save man no other way, but in mercy and justice joyned together, and there being no other in the world but he that could do it so, but he who was God and man; therefore the love to Gods glory and mans good, was requiring him to become a Surety for us. Neither will this take off from the free love and grace of Christ thus in living and dying for us, because it was wholly from his meer goodness to put himself in such a condition of suffering for us, in so much that absolutely he was free to do otherwise. This obligation ariseth only from the supposition, that he will become man for us; and certainly if *Moses*, but especially *Paul* could arise to such a measure of love, as to say, he could desire to be an Anathema for the good of his brethren in the flesh, *Rom.*9 3. no wonder if Christ did absolutely submit himself to be made a curse for us, out of love to Gods glory, and the salvation of man.

But if we speak exactly and properly, we must say, *That command imposed on Christ to die for us, was reducible partly to the moral Law, and partly to a positive and special command.* It was a positive and special command in this sense, because this duty of dying for mans salvation, could not be injoyned any meer man, for that could not be his duty, which was intrinsecally impossible for any man, though possessed with so much perfection as mans nature was capable of. And besides, it must in this sense also be positive, because it was in Gods gracious good pleasure, whether he would open a way or no for the salvation of a sinner, and whether he would accept of a Surety or not. But whatsoever is commanded by the moral Law primarily and directly, its from its own nature intrinsecally good and just; and therefore said not to be just because commanded, but commanded because just. And indeed if it were not so, all the grace of God would be evacuated that is seen in our Redemption: For then God should necessarily will, That Christ should be our Redeemer, and Christ also be necessitated to undertake this Office upon him; so that so farre that here is a particular way commanded, whereby our salvation is to be accomplished, this is altogether po- *Sol.*

ſitive. But in the ſecond place, If we do regard the root and fountain from whence Chriſt as man, was thus willing to be ſubjected to this command, that muſt needs ariſe from the moral Law; for ſeeing the Law doth require even of Chriſt as man, to love God and man perfectly; hence we may ſay that *eminenter* and *virtualiter*, though not *formaliter* it was required by the moral Law. It was by a ſpecial command that there ſhould be ſuch a way injoyned to demonſtrate Chriſts love; yea it was a way ordained by the infinite wiſdom and goodneſs of God: it was wholly ſupernatural both in the inſtitution and revelation of it; yet when that way was made known to Chriſt as man and impoſed on him, it was from the moral Law he ſubmitted to it; the moral Law in the general commanding this, *that whatſoever God ſhall require or appoint as an inſtance to demonſtrate love to him, that we are bound to do:* So that it is here in this reſpect, as in the Command, *Thou ſhalt do no murder*, &c. This Law did oblige *Adam*, though while in the ſtate of integrity there could be no object about which ſuch a prohibition could be converſant. But when through ſin, ſuch temptations are, then the moral Law is put forth into actual exerciſe: So that it is very great weakneſs to ſay, Chriſt was not bound to die for us, no nor any to be Martyrs by the moral Law, becauſe that was given to man in integrity, for the command doth oblige, not only to what was then, but alſo to what new occaſions or objects ſhall riſe afterwards. Thus by the moral Law we are commanded to love our enemies, to believe in Jeſus Chriſt; for though theſe objects were not in the ſtate of Integrity, yet when they ſhall be propounded, they are commanded by virtue of that old Law. Hence our Divines do well demonſtrate againſt the *Socinians*, that Chriſt injoyned no new moral duty, only did interpret the Law in a more ſpiritual and large extenſion, then the Phariſees had done. Thus we may ſay of that perſonal command to the young man, to ſell all he had, though it was in reſpect of the matter, ſpecial and perſonal, yet in reſpect of the original and root, it was from the command of God, which requireth us to love God with all our ſtrength. Its true, the Apoſtle *John*, 1 *Epiſt.* 3. 16. doth preſs

the

the duty of laying down our lives for the Brethren, because of Christs doing so for us, which is a new motive that the moral Law strictly taken, did not know: but its ordinary in Scripture to press an old duty, from some new and special consideration. Thus they are commanded to have one God for their God, because he brought them out of *Egypt*. This holds also in that exploratory command to *Abraham* about killing his son, it was special and positive in respect of the matter commanded, yet when once commanded, it was from the moral Law he should obey. Thus it is also in Christs dying for us, the matter and the way was wholly of free-grace; but when once determined and appointed by God, that this way and no other way he would have man saved, and it being supposed that Christ would become man for us, then that command of love did rule in Christs heart: and therefore *Psal.* 40. he saith, *Behold I come to do thy will. Thy Law is within my heart.* Neither will it follow from hence that Christ as man was bound absolutely to will and procure the salvation of all men, because his humane will was directed and circumscribed by the Divine. Thus we have at large discussed this noble point, that hath so much influence into this Controversie, concerning Christs subjection to a Law, wherein I have closed with those that do hold *Christ as man was subjected to a Law.* And therefore do wonder at those, though great Pillars that will answer the Argument proposed, and put all upon this issue, That Christ was not bound to obey any Law, and therefore what he did by way of obedience it was wholly for us, not that any obligation lay upon him.

Before we dismiss this Point, let us consider what is objected to this Doctrine: And first its said, *Christ though he be a man, yet being one person, and that Divine, he could not be subjected to a Law any more then God himself.* *Obj.*

To this it is Answered, That its true that Christ, both in respect of his Divine nature, as also of his personality, is not bound by any Law, but in respect of his humane nature: and its an acknowledged rule in Divinity, *That by reason of the communication of the properties, we may predicate that of Christs Person in the concrete, which belongs to him only because of one* *Answ.*

of

of his Natures. Thus we say Christ died, Christ suffered; certainly this is more then to say, Christ was subject to a Law, and all is true, because of his humane nature, which was the *principium quo* of these things.

Object. If it be said, that *Laws are given to persons, not to natures, to men, not to humanities in the abstract,*

Answ. Its answered, First, This is not universally true, for the separated souls damned in hell, do yet sinne against the Law of God in that they hate him, and rage at him, when yet they are not subsisting persons.

But secondly, Commands are given primarily to persons, but secondarily and remotely to natures, and therefore though the Law did not immediatly, yet mediately it did extend to Christs humane nature.

Object. It is further objected, *That Christ needed not any command, because he had a perfect inclination within to what is good and holy. Besides to a command there is injoyned threatning, and so it would be thus, that if Christ did forsake or fail in his trust, he would be a sinner, and so guilty of condemnation.*

Answ. But two things may be replied to this, 1. That commands were not given to Christ as they are to meer men, who need direction and quickning to their duty: Therefore such additaments of incouragement, or commination were not necessary to him.

2. It may be granted that even such comminations were added to the commands, yet they made no impression of terrour upon Christ, who was not subject to any failing, and therefore were only to inform how much God did hate or dislike the contrary to what he commanded, not that they supposed any necessity of such spurres to Christ for the performing of what was imposed.

SERM.

SERM. XL.

Some Objections Answered, and Distinctions Examined, concerning the Obedience of Christ.

ROM. 5. 19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

CHrist (we have heard) was truly and properly subject to a Law, and that both general, which concerneth every man, and also particular, which did relate to him as Mediator.

There is one Doubt more to be removed ere we proceed, and that is, *How it could be called a command imposed on Christ to die for us, seeing that his death did depend upon the wicked and corrupt wils of other men, and he was not bound to kill himself: Therefore that seemeth not to be a command to him, the effecting whereof was to be by the wickednesse of others.*

But this is easily resolved, That the command upon Christ was to walk in such a way, and to do that work of God on earth, which he had commanded, not to shrink or flie from duty, in the accomplishing whereof the malice of his enemies would be stirred up to put him to death, and when that hour was come, Christ would not decline it.

Thus I have been large in discussing this Answer, which many learned men give; but upon the weighing of it, it

seemeth to be too light. Though this deep searching into the particulars of it, is very profitable to give light in the controversie.

I proceed therefore to a second Answer to the grand Objection, which was, *That Christ being obliged to the Law for himself, could not fulfill it for us, it was paying his own debt, and so could not thereby discharge ours.*

A second Answer, which seemeth to carry more truth and solidity with it, is, That Christ, though when he assumed the humane nature, he was thereby indispensably subjected to the Law of God, yet because he did freely and voluntarily become man, and so put himself of his own accord into a state of subjection, therefore we may absolutely and truly say, Christ was free from the Law, and this may fully satisfie the Objection. Its denied, that if we speak simply and absolutely Christ was obliged by the Law, because this obligation comes by supposition, and upon a meer voluntary dispensation; for as he was not made man for himself, so neither made under the Law for himself; he did not become man, that he might obey the Law for his own good, but all this was for us. Hence *Isa.9. To us a Sonne is born*; and the Angel told the shepherds, *Luke 1. To you is a Saviour born*, therefore he had his Name *Jesus*, not in reference to himself, *but to save his people from their sinnes*. Thus also *Galat.4. His being made of a woman, and made under the Law*, are put together, with the final cause, why? Not for himself, but *to redeem us from the curse of the Law*: So that if we speak absolutely, we may say, Christ was not bound by the Law, because he did of his meer accord put himself into this subjection; and although while he is in this way of submission, he is bound to obey, yet that is but an hypothetical and conditional obligation: Even as being made man he was bound to suffer for us; for although it was his meer goodnesse to undertake the Office of our Redeemer, yet when once he had taken up that will and resolution, *Behold, I come to do thy will, O God*, then it was necessary he should suffer for us. Therefore the Scripture puts a *Non an oportet* upon it, *Ought he not to suffer, and so to enter into glory*, Luk.22. Then its his duty

ty to drink of this Cup, and it cannot passe away. Therefore Christ was no more obliged to obey the Law for us, then to suffer for us: for it was his voluntary giving up of himself to this work, only when it was once undertaken, it was necessary he should accomplish it, otherwise he would have been unfaithfull in his trust. Therefore these are unclean and unsavoury positions of the *Arminians*, who say, *Christ might have relinquished this Office of Mediatorship, he might not have delighted in the glory set before him.* No, such was his holy perfection, that he had an immutable necessity, though not a natural one, to fulfill his Fathers will. Its then in this case, as the Schoolmen say about the liberty of the will, when the will hath formally determined it self to will, and doth produce such a volition, it cannot do otherwise, for the old Rule is, *Quicquid est, quando est, necesse est esse:* yet they say, That act of the will is free, and the will hath not lost its liberty, though determined. Thus seeing Christ was not originally necessitated to take our nature upon him, and the Scripture attributeth it always to his love, therefore it is that we may say with *Calvin*, he was *immunis*, exempt from the Law: So that although Christ was as man bound to the Law, yet there was a vast difference between him and us, because Christ became man voluntarily, we necessarily and antecedently to our wils, and which is the signal difference, Christ became man, not for himself, or to have eternall life and glory by any obedience, but for us: So that we cannot distinguish of a righteousnesse which Christ had for himself meerly, and another he had for us. And this brings in the examination of some distinctions. As

An examination of some Distinctions.

First, *Of a legal Obedience, and a servile Obedience.* A legal obedience they call that which Christ as man was bound to put forth, even his conformity to the whole Moral Law. Servile obedience they call that which Christ demonstrated in respect of that special command of his Mediatorship: For (say they) *though he was bound as a creature to obey the Moral Law of God, yet he was not obliged in such a low abased manner, both by doing and suffering to procure our Salvation.*

This distinction hath some truth in it, onely its insufficient and imperfect, as it is managed by the learned Authours of it to serve their opinion. And

1. Take notice, that this opinion doth not *Piscatorize*, *For our Justification is not hereby limited to the meer death of Christ, but all that obedience he shewed in his life time, subserviently to the Law of his Mediatorship, both active and passive, do make up our compleat, satisfactory righteousnesse.* So that all active obedience is not excluded, but what is supposed not to be an act of humiliation.

But first, This distinction is built upon a metaphysical abstraction or notional precision of respective formalities. Its true indeed, Christ might from his very birth have been in such a condition, as the glorified Saints shall be. Its the opinion of some Schoolmen and others, that Christ would have been incarnated, though *Adam* had not fallen, because it was such a glorious mystery, and desirable in it self, without any respect to sinne: Onely (they say) then Christ would not have come in a passible body, and then he would not have been in a meriting way, neither would his obedience have had any penality or debasement in it. Whether this be true or no, its not material; onely we grant, That Christ might have taken our nature in a glorious and immortal manner; but *de facto*, Christ did not, yea the Scripture revealeth no other end of his coming into the world, but to be our Saviour, and makes his very Incarnation, and all that he did to be in reference to us: So that howsoever in a mans understanding there may be made such precisive respects, yet in reality, there was no legal act of Christs obedience, but it was servile, *Phil.* 2. The Apostle expresseth the whole state of his humiliation, to be in the form of a servant. Its therefore in vain to dispute of an absolute power, when the ordinary power is in question. The controversie is not, Whether Christ might not have performed legal acts of obedience, that would not have been imputed unto us? But whether he actually did submit himself in that humbled manner to obey the Law for himself, or others? So that Christs legall obedience, but not penall or servile, is an *Ens in intellectu*;

relectu; Its *Resa in hypote*, as in respect of this controversie.

If with *Piscator* it be said; *That this legal obedience did wholly belong to Christ himself.*

I answer, That it did behove him no more to be under the Law, then to be made of a woman, yet certainly he was not obliged to be made man for his own self.

And again, There is no repugnancy, as is to be shewed, that the same obedience should be under one title due and required, and under another title or end to be wholly voluntary and undue.

3. This distinction then in a well-seasoned sense, may be approved of, that Christs obedience as it was penal, was part of our righteousnesse (and *de facto* it was not otherwise) but not as legal; though the members of the distinction are not opposite; for legal obedience may be servile, and servile legal; servile is not here taken in the sense, as we call servile fear: Christ had no such obedience, he did not obey in a servile manner, meerly out of fear; but its called servile, because it was done by him, who was in the form and condition of a servant; and it being servile obedience in this denomination it was also legal. So that this division faileth in the known Rule of Logick; The same obedience is legal in respect of the Rule, and servile in respect of the person accomplishing it.

4. This distinction is not stood to, or any wayes improved by the Authors, or at least very inconsiderably in the protract of the Dispute; for when such Texts are urged, *That the righteousnesse of the Law may be fulfilled in us*; *Christ is the end of the Law for righteousnesse*, or *Christ was made under the Law*; They runne up not to the Sanctuary of this distinction, neither do they seem to acknowledge the impletive obedience of the Law by conformity unto it, though in an humbled manner, but mention altogether the Satisfaction of the penalty of it, by suffering the curse annexed to the transgression of it: So that all along the controversie, I can finde little use made of it; The passive obedience is often mentioned, but the servile active to the Law of

God is very seldome, if at all taken notice of.

4. This distinction will be overthrown by their own principles, and so breedeth that in its own bowels which will destroy it self: for thus we may argue *abhominis*, Christ by his offering up of himself satisfied the penalty of the Law; the Law hath no more to accuse, and where there is no accusation, there is an acquittance; then if so, what need was there of his active, servile obedience in the whole course of his life, What need that go to make up part of our satisfactory righteousnesse, when the other was enough, and took away the whole guilt of Sinne? If satisfying of the punishment of the Law be enough, what needeth the active obedience of Christ either to the Moral, or to the Positive Laws concern to our righteousnesse? So that this servile obedience being necessarily distributed into active and passive, whatsoever Arguments are brought against the active obedience of Christ in the sense affirmed by us, will also militate against the sense affirmed by them: Insomuch that the truth we plead for, will quickly have the victory, if we set that opinion on one hand, which limits our righteousnesse onely to the sufferings of Christ; and that opinion on the other hand which holds Christs servile obedience to concurre also to make our compleat righteousnesse. These two will necessarily conflict so long together, that a third will goe away with the victory.

Lastly, This distinction brought in by learned opponents, doth not at all contradict that truth we plead for, and therefore is wholly impertinently brought to the state of the Question; For those that plead for the imputation of Christs active obedience to the Law of God, either general or special, do grant, That this obedience was wholly servile and debased, that Christ was in a state of humiliation, and not of glorification, while he thus submitted himself: Therefore it may be wondred, why is brought into this controversie, seeing is acknowledged by all, That Christ even while he did obey any Law of God was in the form of a servant, all his obedience was in a debased way, and the lower he submitted himself, the greater was his love to us. There-

fore though once it was vehemently disputed [*Vid. Suarez. in Thom. de Incar. Christi, Quæst.* 20. *Dis.* 44.] Whether Christ be called the servant of God the Father? yet we conclude, there was no just ground for the denial of it, seeing that the Scripture speaks so positively therein.

A second Distinction comes to be examined, that is framed by some who appear against the truth we plead for, and that is of some affinity with the former, though with some difference, *They distinguish of Christs legal Obedience, and his Mediatorial Obedience; His legal Obedience they call that which was given to the Law as he was man, in the same obligation as it did reach to others; His Mediatory Obedience they call that which he did as God-man in accomplishing our Redemption for us.* But this distinction splits at a Rock, as well as the former.

For first, It opposeth those things which are the same, legal Obedience and Mediatorial obedience, as to our controversie are the same, onely denominated from several respects: The same obedience is Mediatory, because done by him, who is the Mediator, and the same is also legal, because conformable to the Law of God: Even as the same works which the regenerate do, may be called the works of the Spirit, and the works of the Law; of the Spirit, because he is the efficient and authour of them, and of the Law, because they are commensurated to that as a Rule. So that this Distinction doth *opponere componenda*. It behoved our Mediator to fulfill the Law for us; and this Obedience is Mediatory, as it respects the Person from whom it floweth; and legal, as it relates to the Rule according to which it ought to be done.

Secondly, As it faileth in exact distinguishing; so it is also very ambiguous, and is such a distinction that it self needeth a distinction; *Facere, negare, & obscure respondere multa sunt*, is a Rule in the Civil Law; for it may be called Mediatory obedience, formally as it comes from Christ the efficient thereof, or matetially, as that which Christ did. Now de true, Christs Mediatorial Obedience is not imputed unto us for righteousnesse, formally as coming from him, for so we

should

should be Mediators and Saviours, but materially, that is, what Christ did that is imputed to us, as if we had done it: So that when we say, Christs Mediatory Obedience is imputed unto us, its not the meaning, as if we were reputed of by God, as the efficients who did it, but as the subjects receiving of it, and applied to us.

Thirdly, This distinction proceedeth upon two false and rotten foundations, as if Christ in obeying the Law did act as a meer man, whereas *Galat. 4. He was made under the Law, that he might redeem us from the curse of the Law*, which could not be by his meer humane Nature, yea this would be to overthrow that meritorious worth which was on those actions he did for us.

And the second rotten foundation is, that the Law Christ was under when working our salvation, was not the Moral Law, or Law of works, but a particular special Law imposed on him as Mediatour: Now this is clearly confuted by that fore-mentioned Text, *Christ was made under the Law, that he might redeem us from the curse of the Law*; but it was the curse of the Moral Law he was to redeem us from, therefore it was the Moral Law he was made under. Besides, By what Law Christ was made a curse for us, that he was under: but he was only by the Moral Law, and not that special Law of a Mediatour, made a curse for us: Therefore the Law he submitted to, was that Law which was in common with us and him. Its true, we have granted a special command to be imposed on him, *viz.* to be our Mediatour, which did not belong to us, or oblige us; but we also have proved, that this Law did oblige him to fulfill all that we were bound to do, whereof obedience to the Moral Law was a very great part, and of which he said, *It was written in his heart.*

To conclude, the summe of this second Answer to that grand Objection is, That Christ absolutely and universally considered, was not obliged to be under the Law, no more then to be made of a woman, or to die for us. This obligation ariseth conditionally, upon his voluntary subjection to such a Condition. And this (I conceive) doth clearly and fully Answer the Objection propounded, yet

that

that the evidence may (if possibly) be more convincing, I shall

In the third place Answer, by way of additional explication to the former, in this manner, That though Christ simply and absolutely, as man, might be obliged by the Law, yet as our Surety and undertaking for us in a *fidejussorial* manner, so his obligation was wholly voluntary and free; for we may conceive of Christ two wayes:

1. As acting and obeying in his single Person.

2. As acting as our Surety and Undertaker. The former Condition is onely in our understanding, and imagined as possible onely; for Christ was not incarnated or made under the Law for himself, but for us. So that although we may conceive,

First, Christs being made man, and thereby an absolute obligation to obey God for himself?

And then secondly, A voluntary stipulation, and an agreement with the Father, to become obedient for us; yet this Distinction will be onely in our understanding, and we shall make two *signa rationis*, whereof one is *prius*, and the other *posterius*; But in reality and existency, Christ never had his humane being, but it was under confederation for us. This is then that which we affirm, That suppose Christ to be made a man, and thereby absolutely obliged to fulfill the Law for himself, yet that he should enter into agreement with the Father, to obey it as a Surety, for such a tearm of years upon the earth, and thereby to procure Salvation for a sinner undone otherwise: This, I say, is wholly gracious and voluntary, and Christ was not obliged to it as a man. In this respect it is, that Christ is called the second *Adam*, because of the Covenant he is under for his people: So that as the first *Adam*, though he was bound in his own person to obey the Law of God, yet was capable of a new obligation for his posterity upon a new title: So that at the same time, if he had continued, his obedience would have been accountable, both to himself and to his posterity. Thus it was with Christ, if we grant, That as man he was bound to obey the Law, yet as a Surety

for us in such a way, he did take the same obligation upon him by another title and consideration: And this truth is made evident thus, If Christ because man was bound to obey the Law, as he did, while on earth, then he was still bound to do so, while he is in heaven, because he doth not cease to be man there; and if obedience do follow upon Christs humane Nature inseparably, as they say, then though in heaven he was obliged to do, as once upon the earth. Grant it therefore, That Christ as man was bound to fulfill the Law, yet to do it in such a manner, by way of a Covenant with the Father for such a space of time, this is that he was not obliged unto, and so this was wholly voluntary. The Apostle notably urgeth this, *Heb. 2. Thou hast made him lesse then for a little time* (as the best Interpreters expound) *then the Angels*. This lesser, this short time of his inferiority and debasement under the Law for us, is that which Christ stipulated for, and to which he was not absolutely as man obliged unto. And thus have we finished the second Objection, wherein we have been very large, because herein did seem to lie the strength of *Samson*, and when that is discovered, the other Objections will the more easily yield themselves.

SERM.

SERM. XLI.

A further dispute for the Imputation of Christs active obedience.

ROM. 5. 19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made Righteous.

WE proceed to a third Argument against the imputation of Christs active obedience, and its thus urged:

If the active obedience be imputed, then the passive is made wholly useless: for seeing by that we are made perfectly righteous, and accounted of as those who have fulfilled the Law, what need any further righteousness? Thus (say they) Christs death is made to be in vain. Arg. 3.

But certainly the weakness and nakedness of this Argument is so visible, that with *Adam*, it may justly runne to hide it self, for several things are to be answered. First, the consequence is wholly denied, for there is a necessity both of active and passive obedience. Christs obedience to the Law, did not supply the virtue of his death, no more then his death did the efficacy of his obedience; so that both his active and passive obedience do concurre to make up one integrall compleat legall righteousness; for the Law requiring both these, it behoved our Surety to fulfill them both: Insomuch that if we could have had a perfect righteousness conformable to the Law, *de novo*, and not have satisfied the punishment, our debt would not have been discharged, we had still been in our sins. Answ.

Rep. — *But* (its replied) *that righteousnes is perfect or not, if not perfect, that should be in stead of Christ; if perfect, you make righteousnes of an infinite worth, then it might serve for all.*

Answ. To this I answer, The whole righteousnes Christ purchased for us, is a full and a perfect righteousnes, to which nothing can be added to make it more perfect: yet this totall righteousnes consists of parts which compleat it, which parts have their partial perfection, but not the perfection of the whole. Neither is this any dishonour to Christ to say, that part of his righteousnes hath not the perfection of the whole, no more then to say, his humane nature, though it was perfect in its way, had not the perfection of the whole person. Every righteous act of Christ was perfect with that respective partial perfection it needed, and altogether made a total and full perfection. This distinction the opponents must acknowledge even in their passive obedience, for why did not the sufferings of Christs soul bring righteousnes enough, why not any pain in his body, as well as death? did not Christ suffer with perfection in these? was there any deficiency in any respect? No certainly, but those partial sufferings were perfect with their respective limited perfection, though no single suffering did amount to that righteousnes which his whole sufferings did. Therefore we cannot properly say, any particular work or suffering of Christ was imperfect, though it had not the totall righteousnes imputed to us, because that is properly said to be imperfect, which wants something its bound to have: A man is not called imperfect (unless negatively) because he is not like God or the Angels, because man is not bound to have those perfections. And thus it is here, Christs particular acts and sufferings singly and severally taken, were not bound to have that compleatnes and perfection, which when conjoyned, they were possessed with. This is like the Popish argument against the perfection of the Scriptures, for (say they) they are either a perfect rule in the whole, or in the parts of them; if in the parts, then one Book of the Canonicall Scripture is enough, and the other superfluous; if in the whole only, then the parts are imperfect, because they do not sufficiently and compleat-

ly

ly direct to salvation. To this the Learned reply, That the whole Canon is a perfect rule, *perfectione totali*, and the several parts, *perfectione partiali*: Every part hath its respective perfection, though not that of the whole Canon.

But it may be further said; *Whatsoever Christ did had an infinite perfection, because of the dignity of the person, and so might be equivalent to any other things.* *Rep.*

I answer, This will overthrow the greatest part of his passive obedience also; Why did not those drops of blood in the garden serve for death by way of equivalency, seeing there was infinite worth in them? and so that position be made good, That one drop of our Saviours blood was enough to redeem the whole world. Certainly the answer they must give to this, we also must make use of, *viz. That infiniteness of worth simply as so, is not enough for satisfaction and merit; but it must be such as is according to the Covenant and contract that is made.* Now the Covenant with man being perfect obedience, and if fallen, satisfaction by suffering: That only could be compensatory, which had these substantials in it; so that although the infinite dignity of the person might be equivalent to many accidentals in the Covenant; yet the substantials and essentials cannot be dispensed with, but must be as it were paid in kinde. *Answ.*

We may retort on the opponents, if the passive obedience be all the satisfactory righteousness we needed, then his active obedience was wholly useless: why should they be more afraid to shut out his passive obedience, then his active? Certainly if we consider the thing seriously, as God in propounding the Law did intend active obedience, primarily, so that is most acceptable in it self: To satisfie the penalty of the Law is only occasional and accidentall: Seeing therefore God did in the first place require this of us, and through the punishment he suffered, Gods end was not obtained by the Law; therefore we should rather fear to make his active obedience useless then his passive; especially seeing that his passive obedience is indeed to be looked upon as no other, then the ultimate and consummate act of his obedience begun in his life time.

Reply. It may be said, *That Christs active obedience is not made useless, because surely we have an excellent example and pattern of holiness to walk by.*

Answ. Its answered, That cannot be thought rationally a sufficient ground for Christ being made man, to subject himself under a Law, meerly to give example: Not to say that this would make Christs life wholly useless to all the people of God that lived before him, for he could not be an example to them, no, nor properly to any but those that lived with him on the earth, that did hear and see all the wonderfull words and works he did. Its true, he is propounded as an example; we are to be patient and full of love as he was, but yet it is a very low consideration to make this the only end of his holy life. The *Socinians* they will grant, that though Christs death was not propitiatory, yet it was exemplary: But we reply, This is a very meane esteem they put upon Christs sufferings, that he should submit himself to them for to be an example only, or to witness the truth meerly. Besides, we may argue against this exemplary life only, as they do against the imputation of Christs righteousness: Christ (say they) had not the righteousness of a Magistrate, of an Husband, of a Wife, for he was not in those relations, therefore his obedience could not be imputed to such as were in those relations. This Objection is to be answered in its time; its weakly urged against the truth we plead for, but strongly urged against such, who make his holy life usefull only, because exemplary, for seeing he left no example of his conversation in such a relation, how could he be a pattern to those that were placed therein?

Reply. If it be further said, that *Christs active obedience is not useless, nor do they reject it, because its for our good, though it be not imputed to us: Even his birth, and his natures were for our good, yet they were not imputed to us as ours, neither was he born in our stead, or made man and God in our room.* And indeed this is a main altar they catch hold upon, thinking none dare draw them off from thence. They distinguish of Christs obedience, *pro nobis*, and *vice nostri*; or *propter nos*, and *pro nobis*: They grant that Christs obedience was for us, that is, for our good:

good: It did qualifie him to be our Redeemer, so that had we not had such an High Priest, as was *holy, undefiled and separate from sinners*, he could not have accomplished our salvation for us.

This is speciously spoken, and gives something to Christ as our Surety, but not enough: They make it only qualificative of his person, not constitutive of our righteousness. That this is not enough to a Surety, appeareth *a pari*, from Christs passive obedience. The *Socinians* do all along readily grant, that Christ died for us: They say his death was *propter nos*, for our good, he would not have died but for us, and so they make mans benefit the finall cause of his sufferings, only they will not yield, *that he died in our room*, that he did it in stead of us, and so suffered what we were obnoxious unto. And although they would shade those prepositions *pro*, *ob*, yea and *ad* also, making them to signifie only the final cause, yet the Orthodox presse this, that he died as a Surety: Now he that dieth as a Surety, doth it not only for the good of another, but in the stead of another, taking the obligation of the debtor upon himself. As it is thus in his passive obedience, so also in his active. To obey the Law of God for our good only, is not enough; so one godly man may do it for another: Parents do obey Gods commands for the good of their children, Magistrates for the good of their subjects; but Christs obedience was more, it was a *substitutionall* obedience, it was the obedience of an undertaker for us; and therefore it must not only be for our good, but in our stead. Thus when the Martyrs, especially *Paul*, suffered for the Elect, it was *toto genere* different from Christs sufferings for them; the one was only for the good of the Church, the other was in the Churches stead; so Christs obedience and the obedience of Christians, who are commanded to make their light to shine before others, do differ in their whole kinds; for a Christians obedience is profitable unto others, but it is not as Christs is vicarious and implesive of the Law in stead of others: Therefore this distinction comes too short, and gives not that full glory to him, which belongs to him as our Surety. *Answ.*

This

This truth is further vexed, for its further urged by a late
Object. Writer, (*Wendelin. Christi. Theol.* lib. cap. 25.) *That Christ must be only under the Law for our good, and not in our stead, because though made man for our good* (saith he) *yet afterwards when he was made man, then he was a man for himself, and so for himself he had need to eat and drink, because he took a body obnoxious to such infirmities as ours are.*

Answ. To this again we Answer, that without doubt, such a distinction is to be acknowledged in Christ, that somethings were in him only qualifying his person, and somethings were properly ingredient unto and constitutive of our righteousness. The former was to be considered only *præsuppositivè* and *materialiter* (as we said the Schools speak) The later *formaliter*, and *immediatè*; of the former sort are his two natures, his Godhead and his manhood, these two were conjoyned in one person for our good, and they did qualifie his person to be our Redeemer, he must be *medius* before he can be *mediator*, he was God for our good, but not God in our stead; he was man for our good, but not in our stead. As it is thus to be granted in respect of his natures, so also in those actions which he did upon other considerations, then as a Mediator, for many things it behoved a Mediator to do, which yet he did not as Mediator. Thus his eating and drinking to preserve his natural life, it behoved him to do thus; for *Thou shalt not tempt the Lord*, is urged by our Saviour against the devils temptation for himself as well as for other men. Now his eating and drinking, though they were *actiones mediatoria*, yet not *actiones mediatoria*: That is, though Christ the Mediator did all these things for our good, yet they were not part of that Mediatorial righteousness for which he stood ingaged, only were required of him *remotè* and *materialiter*, as that without which he could not accomplish his mediatory righteousnesse. Therefore there is great difference to be made between such actions which were requisite to keep him up in the being of a Mediator, and those that were part of his Mediatorship. Its reported of *Paulinus*, that he made himself a captive or servant to redeem another. Now although while he was in that slavery,

very, his eating and drinking, thereby preserving his naturall life, was for the good of that captive whom he redeemed; yet they were not imputed in the same manner, as those peculiar works of slavery and service, which he was bound to do every day: Or if one had undertaken to *Pharaoh*, that he would constantly perform an *Israelites* task for him every day, and make such a number of bricks, though the person so undertaking must necessarily eat and drink, else he could not labour, yet his eating and drinking would not be imputed to the *Israelite*, as that peculiar accomplishing of such a task as the *Israelite* was bound unto. Thus it is in our case, our Lord and Saviour became in a form of a servant for us, undertook to redeem us by performing that work we were bound unto: Now his eating and drinking, that was to preserve his bodily life, and although it was for our good, yet it was not for us in the same manner, as the obedience of the Law, in the duties whereof he accomplished that obligation which was upon us, let us then distinguish between those notions which were requisite to qualifie him as a Mediator, and which were part of his Mediatorship; for though our salvation may be attributed to both of them, yet not in the same manner, for the former are required of him as conditions in his person, the later as ingredients to our righteousness: The former he did *pro se, & pro nobis*: The later *loco nostri*. We then do grant the necessity of this distinction, only we blame them for making his active obedience, to be no more then a condition requisite to his being, and so its concurrent to our righteousness no other waies, then his natural actions, or some miraculous actions, which he did indeed for our good, thereby demonstrating he was the true *Messias*, but he did them not as our Surety: neither could they be called *Sponsorious* obedience: So that we may speak of these things, as Divines do about the merit of Christ, Christ (we say) hath merited the sanctification of our humane nature, but he merited not that we should be men, that comes not by Christs death: Its only *materialiter*, and *per modum substracti*. This being supposed, Christ merited the

sanctification of our natures, as also all other supernatural priviledges.

2. We must not upon any terms grant that all the active obedience of Christ which he did as a man, was for himself, for this will necessarily overthrow Christs merit for us in his life time. It will assert that Christ did not by his holy life merit salvation for us, but make it wholly in reference to himself: and therefore I cannot subscribe to that position I meet with (*Buchal. Hegel. disput. de obedientia & transm. justitiæ Christi. Thesis*) in answer to a fifth reason propounded, *viz.* That it is not necessary that Christ by fulfilling the commands of the moral Law, should merit any thing for himself or us, any more then Angels, seeing every rational creature doth by virtue of creation owe unto God, whatsoever that Law requireth of any one. This seemeth to take away all Christs meritorious obedience for us, as in reference to the moral Law. But to discusse it more narrowly,

Reply.

Answ.

1. Its ambignously spoken, that it was not necessary Christ by fulfilling the Law, should merit for us; for there is a twofold necessity. First, Absolute and simple, and thus indeed it was not necessary, no more then it was that he should be man, or being man, that he should converse with us in that manner he did upon the earth. But secondly, there is an hypothetical necessity, which ariseth from Gods ordination and appointment of him to be our Mediator, or from the stipulation and agreement between the Father and the Son, to procure our Redemption, and thus it was necessary that he should merit by his obedience for us.

2. It doth impertinently confound Angels and Christ together in this matter, for Angels they are now *in termino*, they partake of heaven and happiness, and so are not capable of any reward for what they do, being instated in it already; whereas Christ, though he had right to eternal glory and happiness, yet he put himself into a condition wherein he might merit for us: And therefore

3. This assertion is not clear, because it doth not distinguish of those two conditions, *viatores* and *comprehensores*. The Saints glorified in heaven, yea Christ now exalted in glory, doth

doth still retain his humane nature, and thereby is still a creature, and they do from that inward perfection obey the Law of God materially, though not formally. But there was another consideration both of them and Christ, while they were here on earth. Although it be acknowledged, that Christ, while bodily on the earth, was a comprehensor, yet it is as generally confessed likewise, he was a viator. I will not intangle the Reader with Scholastical intricacies, that are so industriously, but unprofitably vented in this matter. This seemeth to be clear, that though Christ had a right to all happiness, and that from his personal union, yet he put himself voluntarily in such a condition, that he might be under a promise with God, which was by that stipulation mentioned *Isa.* 53. *If he did once put his soul an offering for sin, he should see the travell of his soul and be satisfied:* And by reason of this promise, upon the fulfilling of what he undertook, he was capable of merit, if not for himself, yet for us; so that Christ though in respect of his humane nature even in heaven, he be obliged to love God, yet he is not there in a state of merit, as he was on earth, because no longer under a promise and stipulation; and thus the glorified Saints and Angels, though they love God and do his will, yet its but obedience only materially, because no more under a promise of reward, and is not so much looked upon as their duty, as it is their part of blessedness: even as to praise God, and rejoyce in him is not so much considered as a duty required by the Law, but as part of that glorious blessedness they are made partakers of. Therefore that assertion is dark and cloudy, because it makes no distinction of a rational creature, whether it be in *viâ*, or in *patriâ*, whether under a promise or not.

Yet fourthly, It puts those two things together, which are of a very different consideration, and that is Christ meriting for himself or for us: For there are some Learned and sound Divines, *Calvin* especially, that deny Christ merited for himself, yet I know none, till of late, that question whether he merited for man or no.

Serm. XLII.

In Answering the last Objection, is discussed, Whether and how farre Christ was bound to Obey and Suffer for himself: And shewed that the same Arguments which are brought against the Active Obedience of Christ, make as much against his Passive.

Rom. 5.19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

ALthough it seemeth farre more probable that Christ merited that great Exaltation of himself, as Mediator, which the Scripture so much speaks of by his humiliation here on earth, and yet even that exalted glory he did not so much look upon as his good, as the Churches over which he was thus constituted to be a glorious Head, No doubt but while on the earth he was King and Head of his Church, as the Orthodox maintain against *Socinians*, yet after his Resurrection there was a further possession of glory then before,

fore, his body that formerly was passible, being now made glorious. As for the glory of his Divine Nature he doth not pray for the possessing of that, *John* 17. seeing he had it from the beginning with the Father, but onely for the manifestation of it. But his Mediatory glory, that he was fully invested into upon his Resurrection, and this seemeth more consonant to Scripture, especially that known place, *Phil.* 2. 9. *Wherefore God hath highly exalted him*, &c. For although it is true, that the phrase may denote no more then a meer consequence, or the order that was appointed between his obedience and glory, yet the whole context doth rather favour that Exposition, which makes it as a reward metited by his obedience; and indeed, if we grant, that stipulation and agreement between the Father and the Sonne, concerning the redemption of man-kinde; I cannot see how it can be denied, that Christ merited for himself, seeing the Father promised him not only a seed and inheritance, but his glorious Dominion and Majesty thereby, although (as was said) even this glory of Christ did tend to our good and comfort: Neither hath that Argument any strength to the contrary, That Christ by the personal union had right to all, and so no glory or blessednesse could be denied him; for its no absurdity to say, That Christ might have right to this glory upon a two-fold Title; 1. By personal Union. 2. By obedience: Even as the sonne of some great Monarch may have a right to his Kingdome both by inheritance or succession, and then further by conquest overcoming his subjects, who have risen up rebelliously against him: and this makes more for the glory and honour of Christ, that he would be lifted up to this glory by his humiliation, when it had been no robbery to have taken it otherwayes. It was not then out of indigency or necessity that Christ would partake of this glory in a meritorious way of obedience, but by voluntary condescension, the more to commend his love to us therein. However let Christs meriting for himself be wholly laid aside, yet that he should not merit for us by his holy life, but only in his death, I think is such a *Novelism* that the Church of God, though under many declensions and eclypses, scarce

ever

ever was infested with; for who can perswade himself that Christ should be made man, made under the Law, and he in such a state of humiliation about thirty years, and not all that while be meriting for us, but in that short time of his death? Is it not strange, that he who was made man to be our Mediator, yet should perform no Mediatorial act, till the time of his sufferings? Certainly the Scripture represents Christ our Mediator in all that he did, as well as in what he suffered; for although some things in his life were but necessory and adjuvant, yet the principal and main things of his life were constitutive of our righteousnesse; neither do we advance Christ as we ought, if we look upon his obedience, not as *fide-justorial*, but singly and privately for himself. Hence *Phil.* 2.6,7. the Apostle takes notice of all that obedience of his, which he shewed even from the beginning of his being *in the form of a servant, untill the death of the Crosse*; and *Heb.* 10.7. There that will of his, which he had upon his coming into the world, is made the foundation of all that after-obedience which he shewed untill the oblation of himself. And here in my Text, the Apostle attributeth our righteousnesse to his obedience indefinitely and universally without limiting it to the time of his death. Hence also in *Isai.* 53. where there is so clear a Prophecy of his Mediatorship, mention is not onely made of his sufferings, but his holy life, *By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justifie many*, vers. 11. and *vers.* 9. *he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth*; And the Apostle *Peter* considers, *That it was the just who suffered for the unjust*, 1 Pet. 3.18. I see it disputed by Divines, *whether Christ performed any Mediatorial acts before his incarnation?* [*Vide* Rivet. *in Hosea. cap.* 12.] The Question is not, Whether the fruit of his Mediatorship did not extend to all before Christs birth? For all the Orthodox confesse that: But, Whether he could perform any acts of his Mediatory Office, till he was made man, seeing he was Mediator in both his Natures, and its acknowledged that in respect of his Priestly Office he could not do any Mediatorial acts, but in his Prophetical he did? But now we see it disputed, Whether Christ when made man did exe-

cute

cute Mediatorial acts till the time of his oblation? and not only suppose but [illegible] of his life was not meritorious for us. Certainly, that place *John* 17. 4. might be enough to convince, where Christ saith, *I have finished the work thou gavest me to do*, relating to the whole obedience of his life, as well as respecting his death, and therefore having discharged his whole work, he prayeth for his glorification.

I shall adde one thing more worthy of consideration, if this be admitted as true, *That Christ did not merit for us by his active obedience to the Moral Law, because he was subject thereunto for himself as a creature. Whether this once yielded unto will not also overthrow the merit of his Passive Obedience?* For *Durand.* [*lib.* 3. *Distinct.* 21. *Quæst.* 2.] a Schoolman of no mean note, doth upon this account affirm, That Christ did not satisfie the Justice of God by his death, properly and exactly, because his humane Nature having received so many mercies from God being a creature, that it could never recompense God enough for it self in respect of those favours received. He proceedeth upon this Rule, That there is the same reason of obligation, for satisfaction in respect of sinne committed, and of recompence in respect of benefit received. He that cannot exactly and rigidly do the later, cannot rigidly do the former. Now Christ as man received those inestimable mercies and favours both of Nature and Grace, as the personal Union, habitual Holinesse, &c. than he could not requite this goodnesse of God to him: Thereupon he maketh a distinction of satisfaction, answerable to that which the Schools have of merit. A Satisfaction *de condigno*, when there is a just and equal proportion between the fault committed, and the satisfaction proffered; or a satisfaction *de congruo*, which is, when there is no just proportion in this case of offence, only the friendship and love of the party injured, doth accept of that which of it self is not equivalent.

This distinction is much like that of *Vorstius* his Divine acceptation which he speaks of in this case. Now observe the ground why he makes Christs satisfaction by his passive obe-

dience

dience to be no more then a satisfaction *de congruo*, or a merciful [illegible] which is not to indeed. It is upon this ground, because Christ as a man received such benefits from God, that let him do or suffer never so great things, yet he could not compensate for the benefits he himself received. According to that of *Aristotle*, which he alledgeth 8° *Ethic.* That no man can render equivalent to the gods and his parents. I do not examine the truth and solidity of this Argument, only I desire the opponents to answer it by their principles, and this will appear still the more effectual against them, if that Position be acknowledged, which some Divines of great note affirm, That God by reason of the supream dominion and power he hath over any creature, may impose exquisite and unspeakable torments on a rational creature *per modum simplicis cruciatus*, though not *per modum pœnæ*, which doth necessarily presuppose sinne. To be sure, we see God from his dominion he had over *Job*, exercising of him with wonderfull sorrows and anguishes; and although *Job* was not without sin, yet they were not inflicted for sinne, but upon trial; If then God may without any wrong lay any trouble upon the creature, as a creature, and that is bound patiently to bear it, yea and all those sufferings cannot be equivalent to that goodnesse and love of God which the creature partaketh of; Would not the refractory man say, That whatsoever Christ as man suffered, yet because in those sufferings he was supported and corroborated by God, he could not merit, because what he had was received from above, and so he was by way of thankfulnesse obliged to return it to God again.

Again, There is another Position by the same Schoolmen, which will much presse the adversary, and make against the passive obedience, as well as the active, and that is from the necessity of Christs death, for this he affirmeth [*Lib.* 3. *Dist.* 17. *Quæst.* 1.] That Christ would naturally have grown old and died, as other men, if so be that he had not been violently put to death; He grounds this upon that acknowledgement, that Christ took man nature upon him in a passible way, and so all those defects which do necessarily

and

and indeclinably concomitate mans nature in such a way. Now then I thus argue, If Christ taking our passible nature upon him, was obnoxious to death, as well as to be hungry and thirsty, and to be weary, then there was the same obligation upon him in respect of death, as of obedience to the Law, and as his being a rational creature did necessarily oblige him to obey the Law; so being made man like unto us in all infirmities (sinne onely excepted) he was also obnoxious to a necessity of dying.

If to all this it be said, *That though it be granted, Christ was obnoxious to death, yet not in such a manner, and so circumstantiated, and in that respect it might be satisfactory.*

It is as easily answered, That though Christ as man was obliged to the duty of the Moral Law, yet that he should submit himself to it in such a manner, for such a determinate space of time upon the earth; this was wholly free and voluntary, and so in this respect might be meritorious for us. I intreat the Reader to take notice, that I do no wayes approve of this Discourse of *Durands*, onely its brought *ad hominem*, to have them seriously weigh, Whether the same principles that deny the meritoriousnesse of Christs active obedience, do not also tend to the overthrow of the Satisfactory Nature of his passive, for the falshood of this Schoolmans position lieth in this, as if Christs Satisfaction in the vertue of it was meerly of man, and not of him who was God as well as man; and therefore though a pure meer man suffering, could not satisfie God, among other reasons, for that of *Durands*, because all his support and strength he had from God; yet he that is God as well as man is by that infinite worth redounding from the person to the actions he did, fully inabled to make exact and compleat Satisfaction. This false supposition maketh others also deny the imputation of Christs active obedience, as appeareth by the Authour of that Book, called, *The Price of Mans Redemption*, where he distinguisheth Christs legal obedience from his Mediatorial, and makes that to be done by him as a man, as if Christs actions did not come from him as he was a person,

God-man, though the formal principles by which they were effected, were either his Divine or humane Nature. Although therefore it be granted, That Christ as man was obliged to the Moral Law, yet what action he did in reference thereunto, being the action of him that was God as well as man, it was of infinite worth for us, especially it being intended and applied by our Saviour for that end.

Before I finish this particular, it will not be altogether impertinent to consider, *What is the true Doctrine about Christs death, whether it was natural, or meerly miraculous?*

Some (you have heard) affirm, *That Christ because he took our passible Nature upon him, would have died, though he had not been violently put to death. For* (say they) *as the Personal Union did not prohibit a violent death, no more would it a natural; and as it was no reproach or dishonour to Christ to die a violent death, no more would it have been to die a natural one.*

Another late Writer, [*Pinchin, Price of Redemption*] among other new and wonderfull opinions, asserts this also, *That Christs death was wholly miraculous, that all the* Romans *and* Jews *could not put him to death, but he did voluntary dissolve that union of the soul and body himself; so that he did not by those pains die as other men from the principles of nature, but by his own voluntary concurrence.* But this is directly contrary to Scripture, *Acts* 3. 15. 1 *Thessal.* 2. 15. where they are charged expresly to have *killed Christ*, and that as they did the other Prophets. Its true, there were many wonders about Christs death, and in some sense it might be said to be miraculous, but not so as therefore it should be denied to be also in some sense natural: Therefore the truth lieth between these two extreams; for though Christ took our Nature upon him with the principles of death, yet it may not be said, he would have died naturally, if they had not crucified him; for that is said to be future, not which is to be so according to the second and inferiour causes, but what is according to the singular Will and appointment of God:

Now

Now God had appointed his death for no other end but to be by way of a voluntary oblation for us, which it could not be if it had been the tribute of Nature: Neither do the principles of dying argue death necessarily, for *Enoch* and *Elias* were in mortal natures, yet they did not actually die, and at the last day many shall not die, but have an equivalent change: Even as we may say, The body of Christ in the grave could not putrifie or corrupt, because of Gods singular will about the speedy Resurrection of it; for its said, *He would not suffer his holy One to see corruption*: So that its unjustifiable to say, Christ would have died naturally, if he had not been put to that violent death; and though Christ was *hungry* and *weary*, yet we never reade that he was *sick*. Nay, Divines say, he could not be any wayes capable of any bodily sickness. But yet on the other side, its an errour to say, Christs death was wholly miraculous, that by the punishment of the Crosse, with the pains thereof, there was not a natural death. Neither could his enemies kill him; for although this be true in respect of his Divine Nature, so that he could have hindred all the men of the world from killing of him: So that in respect of his Divine Will, he said, *He had power to lay down his life, and to raise it again*; yet seeing his Divine Nature did leave the humane Nature in its operations to its self, without which our Redemption could not be accomplished; in this dereliction his death did proceed from natural principles, even as his hunger and wearinesse. Its true, Christ did not die against his humane will, for with that he willingly accepted of the death imposed on him; yet for all that we may not say he killed himself, or was his own executioner. And thus much occasionally.

That which I chiefly intended, is to examine, *Whether some Arguments that militate against the Active Obedience, do not also rise up against the Passive.* And we may take notice, That *Bernard* (*Epist.* 190.) writing against *Abilardus*, the first that ever appeared to deny the Satisfactory Propitiation by Christs death, making it onely exemplary, doth oppose him, not onely by asserting the redeeming power in Christs

death, but the imputation also of his righteous obedience: Hence are those expressions, *Assignata est ei aliena justitia qui carnit sua*, Anothers righteousnesse is assigned to him, who wanted one of his own. Again, *Justum me dixerim sed illius justitiâ; quanam ipsa? finis legis Christus ad Justitiam omni credenti*, I will call my self righteous, but by his righteousnesse; And what is that? *Christ is the end of the Law for righteousnesse to him that beleeveth.* Lastly, That it is very clear, *Si mea traducta culpa, cur non & mea indulta Justitia? & sane mihi tutior donata, quam si inherens*, If *Adams* sinne can by traduction be made mine, why not righteousnesse be also indulged and imputed to me? Certainly righteousnesse thus given is more safe then what is inherent. This righteousnesse is not onely to be limited to his death, but to his whole conversation in the world for us.

Object. 4. Its time to hasten to a fourth Argument, and that is thus managed, *If Christ obeyed the Law in our stead, then we are not bound to obey it, for a two-fold obedience to the same Law is superfluous.*

Answ. But this will not hold the respondent long; for its readily granted, That obedience is not required of us to the same end, and for the same purpose that it was of Christ: Christ obeyed the Law for our Justification, but we by way of gratitude, and to testifie our thankfulnesse: Even as in the Passive Obedience of Christ, Christ suffered pains and death to atone and reconcile God, nevertheless we die, and are exercised with many afflictions, but not to the same end for which Christ suffered: his sufferings were propitiatory, but so are not ours.

Reply. This Answer is true and solid, yet there is endeavour to demolish it; For (say they) *We are not bound to the obedience of gratitude, if Christ hath fulfilled all obedience for us*; For the Morall Law requiring gratitude, and Christ fulfilling that for us, we cannot be obliged to Obedience either in respect of Justification or Gratitude.

Answ. To fully satisfie this, Its not so safe to acknowledge Obe-

dience

dience a duty onely by way of Gratitude, but that simply its required by the Law still as Obedience, *Love as Love, Zeal as Zeal*, &c. Onely *these are not required as ingredients to our Justification, but as the means and way wherein onely we can be partakers of the benefit of Christs active Obedience.* For although Christ did fulfill the Law for such who are his, yet this is not imputed and accounted immediately unto every one, but its applied in that way and order, which God hath appointed; and that order is to communicate the benefit of his active Obedience to none but such, who shall by faith receive him, and obedientially walk in his commands; For Christ did nothing for us to encourage sinne, or nourish security. And thus it is in his passive Obedience, Christ laid down his life as a ransome and price for his, yet not so as they are thereby immediately acquitted from all guilt, but the efficacy of it is communicated unto such as take the way he hath prescribed; so that neither active or passive Obedience of Christ, do any good but to such who apply it in that way God hath commanded: The effects of Christs death being not immediately accomplished upon any, but mediately according to those instituted means he hath required.

Serm. XLIII.

More Objections Answered, and the Doctrine cleared from Antinomianisme.

Rom. 5. 19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

I Hasten to a fifth Argument, which indeed is not so much an Objection as a calumny: for this innocent truth of the imputation of Christs active obedience is arraigned for manifest confederacy with that Antinomian dotage, and poisonous doctrine, that *God seeth no sinne in Beleevers.* Yea its positively asserted to be as genuine issue of the doctrine we plead for, as *Ishmael* was of *Hagar*: And it is not an enemy that doth our Doctrine this wrong, one of the Jesuitish profession; but even a familiar friend: Though its a wonder men should be in earnest, when they object thus; for certainly they must with the Adder, stop their ears that they may not hear what the Orthodox say in this matter.

Object. 5. They discourse thus, *If Christs perfect righteousness be made ours, so that we be as righteous as Christ is, then God seeth sinne no more in us, then he doth in Christ.*

Answ. To this several things are responsible. 1. There is a calumniating mistake interposed in the Argument, as if it were asserted, That a man by imputed righteousnes, is as righteous as Christ. This is the frequent reviling of our Doctrine, by

Popish

Popish Writers. The Orthodox renounce any such consequence, and will not suffer such a Viper to fasten on them. Its one thing to say, that the righteousnes of Christ is imputed to a believer, and another thing that he is as righteous as Christ. For 1. Christs righteousnes is not imputed to us, according to that latitude and infinite worth it is in Christ, but according to our necessity and want. 2. Christs righteousnes is in Christ personally and inherently, and so denominateth him from an intrinsecal ground, but it is in us only by imputation and account, and that according as we receive it by faith, which is imperfect and full of wavering. 3. Its in Christ efficiently, so that he is the Author and procurer of it. It is in us only as the subjects who do receive it. This and much more is to be said to manifest the weakness of that position (We are as righteous as Christ.) But more of this in answering the Popish Argument.

3. In answer to this charge, we say, that the *Socinian* doth likewise manner argue against satisfaction by the passive obedience of Christ in his death; for thus they argue, Where the whole debt is paid, there remaineth no more debt, but Christ by his death hath paid the whole debt, therefore there remaineth no more. What is this, but that God can see no sin in that for whom Christ hath satisfied? for sinne is the debt and all that is discharged, God will not require the payment of the same debt twice. Thus (say they) the doctrine of Christs satisfaction opens a door to all impiety, and makes all holiness needless. Now what is answered to this in behalf of the passive obedience, may as truly and fully be improved likewise for active obedience.

But 3. we may say to the opponents, Why do they not pull this beam out of their own eye first; for this if it be a chain of Iron, will binde them as well as any. They themselves do acknowledge a satisfactory righteousnes by Christs death; and upon this account they plead against the active obedience, because when the penalty of the Law is removed, and all sinne of omission and commission satisfied for, there remaineth no more accusation of the Law; the Law is perfectly satisfied, and therefore can no more condemn. Then certainly,

certainly, where the Law cannot accuse, there sinne cannot be imputed: So that the two opinions about active and passive obedience differ not in this, Whether the Law be perfectly satisfied, and an infinite atonement made, but only Whether the passive doth solely concurre, or active and passive both.

Therefore in the fourth place, the true and solid Answer, to vindicate the Doctrine of active and passive obedience from such uncharitable consequences, is, That the imputation of Christs doing and suffering for us, is not absolute and immediately taking place, without any order or means, but God hath so ordained the communication of this rich and infinite treasure, that whosoever believeth and walketh holily is made partaker hereof; and therefore this righteousnes is received *ad modum recipientis*: now the faith of the best believer is subject to paraliticall shakings, every one may cry out, *Lord I believe, help my unbelief*. The cruise we bring is not large enough to hold all the oyl, for as Divines say, even of the blessed and glorified Saints in heaven, though made perfect, yet that they do not know, love, or rejoyce in God, comprehensively, as much as God injoyeth himself: How much more is it true, that no godly man in this life, who hath imperfections mingled with all his graces, can truly and fully receive Christ, *quoad ultimum quod fic*, so that no more of Christ is to be received? Though therefore the righteousnes imputed be perfect, yet the receiving and participation of it is imperfect; and as we say in sanctification against Papists, Though good works in respect of the Spirit of God or grace from which they flow are perfect, yet in respect of us, who do subordinately act, they receive imperfection; so though the obedience of Christ, as it is accomplished by him be every way perfect, and hath no sinne in it, yet as we receive it there is much imperfection in us, and so God must needs see sinne in us, while we do stretch out our hands to lay hold on it; Though by the imputation of Christs righteousnes, then this weakness is so covered, that its not imputed to us. Therefore when the Antinomian would illustrate their dangerous opinion, as flowing from Christs imputed obedi-

ence, from a similitude of a red glass, by which every thing in the glass is represented to be red, and nothing then can appear otherwise then red, so God seeth nothing but the righteousness of Christ in his people, and therefore no sinne, but they are as righteous as Christ. This halteth down right, and is not to the purpose, for therefore doth the matter contained in a red glass seem red, because the *medium* is *indispositum*, there is not a fit *medium* to conveigh the *species* of the object, so that in such seeing, the visive faculty is deceived, and apprehends things otherwise then they are: But we cannot without blasphemy attribute such imperfections to God, for God seeth all things as they are with an intuitive knowledge; there cannot be any indisposed *medium* to his eye; to him darkness and light are all one, therefore he cannot but see the imperfect graces, and other sins of his people which are in them, notwithstanding this imputation: only he doth not so see them, as to punish them being already satisfied for in Christ. But the Antinomian doth not only deny a judicial seeing of them, but even an intuitive: Of which errour I have elsewhere spoken more largely, (*Vindic. Legis.*)

2. Though Christs perfect obedience be imputed, God doth see sinne in Believers, because this righteousness is not inherent in them. Therefore they confound imputation and inherency, who would gather thorns of this Vine, and turn this fish into a serpent; If so be that imputation did take away the inherent filth of our natures, then God would no more see sinne in us, then he doth in the glorified Saints of heaven. But with this imputation is consistent these reliques of corruption, which sometimes also are very active, and which God takes notice of in his people, and for which he doth in this life chastice them: Though therefore the imputed righteousness of Christ be as truly ours, as if it were inherent, yet it is not inherent, and so what corruption doth abide in us, God cannot but see it. And that this may be the more transparent, let us call in the

Sixth Argument, which is an arrow out of the Popish quiver, although seconded by others, *If Christs righteousness be made ours formally, as if we had his righteousness, then are we* *Object. 6.*

as righteous as Christ, then are we Mediators and Redeemers. Yea this is seconded by those who do not Romanize. *Christs righteousness is Mediatory* (so its pleaded) *fitted, and proper only for him, who is God and man, so that it is incommunicable to any man; its high presumption for any mortall man, to conceit he appeareth in Christs Robes: This is transcendent robbery to make our selves equal with Christ, &c.*

Answ. Thus at large Popish Writers and others expatiate in the decrying of this imputed righteousness, grosly mistaking all the while the sense in which this imputed obedience is maintained, and therefore let us Answer the Objection united together, though from different Authors, with different principles.

First, To be made formally righteous with Christs righteousness is an ambiguous and deceitfull expression; and certainly the opponents seem to take formally in a Physicall sense, as a form inwardly denominating a man, as a man is said to be wise by wisdom, to be healthfull by health. Thus they attribute to us, as if we asserted a man absolutely just in our selves by such an imputed righteousness. Whereas this sense is wholly renounced by Protestant Writers, as a contradiction, therefore many Learned Authours refuse the word formall, and say, Christs righteousness is the matter of our Evangelicall righteousness, which received by faith, we are thereby made righteous: Although there are very worthy and pious Writers that do grant the word *formaliter*, for they say, this formality is not in us, but in *reputatione divina*, so that we are not to conceive of it as a *Physical*, but *Civil* or *Legal* formality; as when it is said a prisoner is acquitted, the formality of this lieth not in any thing inherent in the prisoner, but in the Judges absolution: so when a believer is constituted, First, It is not by any thing infused in him, but what is accounted by Covenant through Christ unto him. And if men were not captious in this sense, we might safely and roundly affirm, that by Christs obedience imputed to us we are formally made righteous; for even amongst the Papists themselves there are acknowledged extrinsecall forms that do give a denomination to the object, as when such a thing

thing is said to be known or seen, here is a denomination from an extrinsecall form, yea its the generall opinion of many Schoolmen, that a man might be accepted of by God, graciously, though there be no inward change or infusion of holiness in him: Now in such cases supposed, a man would have been said to be accepted of and beloved by God from a meer extrinsecall respect; So that the foundation of this mistake lieth herein, that they will not distinguish between an *absolute physicall* form, informing its subject, and a *moral, relative, state* in a man, which receiveth its denominations from some extrinsecal causes. It may then, if the phrase be understood *civiliter* and *legaliter*, not *physice*, be granted that we are made formally righteous by Christs obedience imputed unto us; although to avoid needless contentions, which men are so prone to make, for peace sake, its called rather the matter of our righteousness. Secondly, And though this be granted, yet it doth not follow, that we are as righteous as Christ, for the reasons briefly mentioned before, and now more properly to be insisted on.

Though Christs righteousness be imputed to us, yet we are not as righteous as Christ.

For first, This is not imputed to every believer, according to the dignity and worth that it hath, as formally abiding in Christ, but according to the necessity and exigence of sinfull man; so that it is to be conceived in the manner of an universall and infinite Treasure, which makes rich every poor man interested therein, though not one of them hath all the Treasure communicated to him, but respectively and distributively for his use: Or as the Sunne filleth every starre with its proper respective light, yet is not thereby made as glorious as the Sunne: So that Christs righteousnesse, as in Christ, and as imputed, differ; for it is in Christ as the subject naturally recipient of it; it is in us according to our necessity, that partake of it by faith.

Secondly, Its in Christ as the efficient, and he that doth work it; it is in us as the passive subject for whom its prepared, insomuch that its abhorrent from all reason, to say, that because Christs obedience is imputed to us, therefore we are Redeemers and Saviours; but in a passive sense, therefore we are redeemed and saved: Insomuch that none say

Christs obedience is imputed unto us, in such a sense as that we should be said to be the efficients of that righteousness, but that we should be the passive subjects receiving the benefit of it. And indeed if there be not some kinde of imputation of what Christ suffered for us, how can it be said, that *Christ died for us*, that he was a *Surety for us*. This is so evident and clear, that *Bellarmine* himself confesseth that Christs merits are imputed unto us, because they are given to us, and we may offer them up to God the Father for our sins, because Christ took upon him the burden of satisfying God for us, and reconciling of us to the Father: In this sense (saith he) the Protestants opinion would be right; though he addeth, *Quamvis modus loquendi in Scripturis, & Patribus, aut nunquam, aut rarissime inveniatur*: Which later clause makes the whole saying like new wine in the old bottle, it breaketh and marreth all. Only thus farre we have a confession, that Christs satisfactory righteousness is so given to us, that we may offer it to the Father for our selves. Now will it follow that because its given to us, therefore we are as righteous as Christ, and we are Redeemers?

In the third place, consider, That there is a distinction between the obedience it self, and the manner of application of it: though the obedience imputed be of infinite worth and dignity, yet the application of it is in a finite and limitted manner. If a Jewel of rich price be laid down for many captives, there is a great difference between the price of the Jewel and the application of it: The application of it is particular and respective, not according to the whole worth of the Jewel, for one man, especially this application being made with much imperfection and weakness. But to lay the axe to the root of the tree, that it may never grow more,

Lastly take notice, That this whole Argument is built upon the sand, for in Christ there is his Office, and the righteousness acquired or purchased by his Office: Now we do not say, his Office is imputed to us, nor so is his Mediatory obedience, as its the execution of his Office imputed to us, but the righteousnesse he merits and obtains by this; so that though Christ be our Surety, yet we are not thereby made Sureties:

That

That is ridiculous to say, the debtor is made a Surety, because the Surety undertakes for him. Christs Office of Mediatorship is incommunicable, but the righteousnes acquired by it is to be communicated to every member of his. Therefore we grant it would be blasphemy for any to conceit he appeareth in Christs robes: In this sense, we justly blame the Papists for making *Angels* and *Saints Mediators*: They hold Christ merited and satisfied, that we might merit and satisfie: This is to hold the imputation of Christs Mediatorial Office, unto a creature, which no doubt Christ is jealous of; but the truth we plead for is as distant from this as light from darkness. Its not the Office, nor the executory acts thereof that are imputed to us, but that righteousnes which is the effect and fruit of these. And this may more then suffice for this Objection.

In the sixth place, its objected, *That the active obedience of Christ cannot be imputed to every believer for their legall righteousnes, because Christ did not perform such a righteousnes as was fitted for every person and every relation. Christ would not act as a Magistrate, how then shall a Magistrate have righteousnes imputed? Christ did not perform the duties of many relations, such as a Wife, a Servant, &c. and therefore how shall they stand justified by the legal obedience of Christ, when that righteousnes of his was not conformable to that part of the moral Law which concerned them in their relations?* To this also I may adde a further Objection, though of the same affinity, *Infants dying need not the imputation of the active obedience of Christ, for seeing no actual obedience was required of them, therefore they needed not the imputation of such a righteousnes.* Obj.

To Answer this, first take notice also, that the *Socinian* doth thus argue against the passive satisfactory obedience of Christ, which yet the Learned opponents do cordially abominate; and what Answer they would shape to their Objection, will serve for this. The *Socinian* argueth, Christ did not die as a Surety in our stead, for then he must have suffered all that we ought to do; but he did not suffer eternal torments: and as for a temporall death (saith he) then he was bound to suffer as many individual deaths, as every man was Answ.

to die. Therefore in the second place its truly Answered, That as Christ in suffering death for us, was not thereby bound to suffer every kinde of death or sickness, which yet is the curse of the Law for sinne, but death in the substance of it, so neither was Christ bound to obey for every relation, but its enough that he fulfilled the Law by loving of God, and his neighbour, which is made the summe and substance of the Moral. If a Surety pay the debtors summe of money he oweth (suppose an 100^{lb}) in gold, and not in so many several shillings or other pieces of silver, he is by the Civil Law discharged of his debt. As therefore it would be ridiculous to say, that a man afflicted with the gout, or troubled with any other infirmity, could take no comfort from Christ, in respect of sinne the cause of it, because Christ never had any such distemper or pain; for its enough that by his death he overcame sinne in all the particular effects of it. Thus every Christian in his several relations may support himself from that obedience which Christ did perform to the substance of the Law: for as in his sufferings, the dignity of his person made up the accidentals by equivalency, especially in such things as were inconsistent with his person, as despair, *&c.* so in the accidentals of obedience, the dignity of Christs substantial obedience did make compensation, especially in such things as were incompatible to his Mediatorship: As to be a woman, or wife, to be a temporal Magistrate, these things were not consistent with that Office of a Mediator, he had undertaken: and seeing by the adversaries themselves it is acknowledged, that love is virtually and eminently the fulfilling of the Law, what need any further dispute? If it be said, that the Law holds no ἀνταλοιδνῖ, it must have eye for eye, *&c.* will not this overthrow his passive obedience as well? for what he suffered was not every way *idem*, or the same which the Law required: But the weakness of this will be discovered in the next Objection, only what hath been said for several relations, the duties whereof Christ never performed, will also answer the doubt about infants, Christ obedience being communicated to every subject, according to the necessity of it.

SERM.

SERM. XLIV.

More Objections Answered.

ROM. 5. 19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made Righteous.

I Meet with a seventh Objection against the Imputation of Christs active Obedience in the sense contended for, which is managed in this manner, *This Doctrine* (its said) *supposeth us to have been in Christ, at least in a legal title, before we did believe, or were born, and that not only in a general and conditional sense, as all men, but in a special, as the Justified.* And to this purpose it is again urged, *That this opinion seemeth to ascribe to God a mistaking judgement, or to esteem us to have been in Christ when we were not, and to have done and suffered in him, what we did not.* *Object. 7.*

To Answer this, First, by the way, I fear a snake is in this grasse, else I cannot understand that passage; All men are in Christ in a general and conditional sense; I doubt if this be opened, some viperous brood may be discovered: Will not this make Christ a conditional Head, and his death a conditional death? and so if closely pursued assert at last, That though Christ died, yet not one man might be justified. Besides, Is there any condition required in the person to be justified, that is not the fruit and effect of Christs death? Did not Christ die to sanctifie us, as *Joh.* 17. 18. as well as to justifie *Answ.*

ſtifie us? Are not faith and repentance purchaſed by Chriſts death as well as Goſpel priviledges? Did Chriſt die for beleevers, if they did beleeve; for true penitents, if they did repent? I might enlarge my ſelf in this, to ſhew how uſeleſſe and helpleſſe this Aſſertion is, either doctrinally to evade any difficulty (for which yet it ſeemeth at firſt it was invented) or practically to give any true ſolid comfort, doubting about the particularity of the benefit by Chriſts death: But this would be to erre from my ſcope.

In the ſecond place therefore I come to the Argument, as relating to my work in hand; and here I muſt freely acknowledge, that I ſee not the leaſt ſhadow of any ſuch conſequence, *viz. That the Imputation of Chriſts actual obedience doth ſuppoſe us to be actually juſtified in him before we had a being.* Its true, the *Antinomians* they uſe to make ſuch *non ſequiturs*, but not ſo much, as I remember, from Chriſts actual obedience, as his paſſive. Therefore ſome of them urge, That becauſe its ſaid, *God laid on him the iniquities of us all, and he bore our ſinnes upon the Croſſe*, from that time every beleever was actually juſtified (though others of that way carry it as high as to eternity it ſelf:) So that this is no more a genuine iſſue of the Doctrine of the imputation of Chriſts active obedience, then of his paſſive; and indeed if it could be faſtened upon either, it would more conſonantly follow from his paſſive obedience. Hence the *Socinian* argueth from the Doctrine of Chriſts death as a ranſome and price, that all men ſhall be ſaved; *For* (ſay they) *when the price is paid, and accepted of, its injuſtice to afflict the Debtor any more.*

But thirdly, There are eminently learned men, that are deſervedly reckoned in the number of the Orthodox, that do poſitively hold, *That the members of Chriſt were formally juſtified in him, before they had a being*; as we ſay, *All were formally made ſinners in* Adam, *before they had a natural being.* Though I have elſewhere modeſtly given in reaſons for my diſſent herein, and as yet am not convinced to approve of it, or ſubſcribe to it.

Therefore in the laſt place, the true and proper Anſwer is, That

That though Christs active obedience be imputed to us, yet it is in such a way and manner as God hath appointed: Even as although Christ died for the remission of our sinnes, yet this is not actually applied to any, but in the Method God hath ordained, so it is with his active obedience, for these effects of his death do not flow from it by way of a naturall resultancy, for then all would be justified, all would be saved, but according to that ordered way which is appointed in Scripture: So that in this particular the passive obedience and active are all one; neither doth this Argument oppose one more then the other: Neither can any mistake be attributed to God by the opinion of active obedience, more then passive; for God doth not account these things as ours, but when they are ours; when God looks upon us as fulfilling the Law in Christ, its a truth, and we do so; only its by a civil and legal account, or rather its by that gracious Covenant which the Father made with Christ our Surety, by which means we may *in ordine gratiæ*, say of Christ, which Christ said *in ordine naturæ*, of his Father, *All mine are thine, and thine are are mine*, though with much disproportion and dissimilitude.

The eighth Objection deserveth more serious consideration, *viz. That the opinion of imputation of the active obedience of Christ, supposeth Christ to have paid the* Idem, *and not the* Tantundem, *whereas its thought, that Christ only paid the value, and not the same debt that was due.* *Object. 8.*

But first, I cannot see the naturality of this consequence, yea its thought by the Opponents the clean contrary; for we heard one Argument objected against this active obedience, was, because Christ did not perform the duties of all several relations, not of a wife, or a servant, or a Magistrate; and therefore such an imputation could not justifie those who were so related; for the Law requireth that of them, which Christ never did. Thus you see this Doctrine of Christs active obedience is assaulted, because it doth not make Christ pay the *Idem*, and yet how it is arraigned, for making Christ to pay the same, and not the value. *Answ.*

2. I conceive it is very dangerous to assert, That Christ paid,

paid the same rigidly every way, as also to affirm, that he did no wayes pay the same, but what was equivalent: That Christ did not rigidly pay the same in every respect is plain, because he died but one death, whereas every sinner was bound to die his particular death, so that Christ was to have died as many deaths, as they in particular, had not his own served for all, and so his death was but for a season, not eternall, whereas that which the sinner should have suffered would have been eternal. Now eternall duration was equivalently made up by the dignity of the person. Thus it was also for Christs active obedience, those particular duties which were required in several relations, were equivalently made up by his summary obedience in his love to God and man, it being impossible that this love should be diversified in all respects; for Christ could not be a man and a woman, a servant and a Magistrate at the same time: So that as he was tempted like us in all things, sinne onely excepted, thus he did obey *like us in all things*, onely such things excepted, that did suppose such an imperfection as was incompatible with his Mediatorship, or else did include an impediment or hinderance of it. It is then granted, That in circumstantials or accidentals, as also in such things which would have argued either sinne or some impediment to his mediatory Office, there was not the *Idem* paid, but the *Tantundem*, and necessity compels to this, for he could not in such a condition have accomplished our redemption. But if we speak of the Substantials and Essentials, which the Law required or threatned, then we must take heed of a *Tantundem*, lest it prove no satisfaction at all at last; for grant that the Law in the threatning part, and in the preceptive part, was not substantially compleated by Christ, then what need any Satisfaction at all? Justice was to be satisfied, because the Law was to be satisfied: if then the Law be abrogated or changed, so that the penalty required is not necessarily to be born, nor the duty it commanded necessarily to be fulfilled, I see not thus why Christs death should be called a Satisfaction: Therefore if we speak of the Substantials of the preceptive and comminative part of the Law, we must hold that Christ paid the *Idem*, I

do

do not mean *numero*, but *specie*, the same in kinde that the Law required of us; and therefore it was, that though Christ in his Agonies did sweat drops of blood, yet this was not Satisfaction, because the Law required death; and thus though Christ died, yet his death could not be equivalent, or in the room of active obedience to the Law, because that required actual righteousnesse, as well as bearing the penalty. Again, If Christ did not pay the same in kinde, but *Tantundem*, then the verity of the Law, and the veracity of the Law-giver fals to the ground; Why is it that the Law is said to be established, that no *iota* or *tittle of it shall passe away*, unlesse because though it be not fulfilled in us, yet it is in our Surety? Why is it said, That none can be justified by the Law, but because the Law still requireth perfect and compleat holinesse? we must not then think that the Law either in the preceptive or threatning part is changed and altered from what it was once. Furthermore its of necessity, that Christ must pay the *Idem* in the Substantials of the Law, because the learned Opponents do grant, That God did not abrogate or repeal that Law, *In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die the death*; If then it was neither abrogated nor repealed, but admitted of a relaxation, then certainly the *Idem in specie* was paid by Christ, and if this be granted in the penalty of it, in respect of Christs passive obedience, I confesse I cannot yet see why it should not also be yielded in respect of the active obedience; For why should that Law stand immoveable, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things the Law required*, and therefore Christ must be made a curse, and not that Law also, *Do this and live*, and therefore Christ must do this as well as suffer this for us, if we would live: And this will be still the more undeniable, if we consider, that Christ came into the world as a Surety for us: So that what he did, though it was out of grace and favour to us, yet he was pleased to make it his obligation and debt for us, ere he would discharge it. As for that *crambe* so often boyled, That if Christ paid the *Idem*, then he must despair and suffer the worm of conscience, *&c.* We have answered enough already; onely we may adde, that if it be thorow-

ly considered, despair as it is a sinne, is not in the damned in hell, neither can it be: for if we take it privatively, as opposite to the grace of hope, in which sense it is a sinne, so the damned do not despair, for there is no promise of grace to them, and so its not their duty to hope, being they are now no longer under the day of Salvation; so that their despair is not a sinne. Indeed if we take despair negatively for being without all hope, so they do despair, but that is not their sinne, seeing God hath manifested there is no more hope for them, but part of that eternal misery which is in hell. Therefore it is not necessary, that if Christ suffered the threatning for us he should despair.

But in the second place, It was necessary Christ should suffer the threatning for us, so farre as it could be without sinne, for otherwise he could not be our Mediatour, but he himself would have needed a Mediatour: Now to despair privatively is a sinne, and Christ could never be in a Condition wherein he could say there was no hope for him, because as he had *power to lay down his life, so also to take it up again*; and as for the spiritual death of sinne, which was in the threatning, it could not stand with the holinesse and perfection of Christ to bear that; neither was it necessary, seeing that we did bear that in our own persons, being by nature dead in sins. The summe is this, That there was a mitigation in that threatning, though the Law said, *Thou shalt die*, yet it did not exclude another, it was not thou, and no other in thy room: therefore the wisdom of God found a way, whereby the Law for the matter of it might be preserved, and the mitigation was in respect of the person; so that *alius solvit* not *aliud solvitur*, its another that dischargeth the debt, but it is not another debt if we speak of substantials.

Doubt. To clear this, one doubt may be moved, *If Christ did thus satisfie the Law, and so the Justice of God, then it was necessary that he should do or suffer no more then the Law required, but Christs satisfaction was superabundant, and able to save more then it doth save, and was more pleasing to God in the way of obedience, then all our sins did displease God in the way of disobedience.*

The

The Answer to this is, That if we respect the substance of Christs obedience and sufferings, he did no more then the Law required; The love of the Father would not suffer that more sufferings should be imposed on him then Justice required: but if we regard circumstantials, as the dignity of his Person, and the cause of his sufferings, or servile obedience, so he did more then the Law required; for the Law did not require that the man who died should be God also, or that he should be without sinne, who thus suffered. Its true, The Law of a Mediatour required so, but that was not incumbent on him as Mediatour, which did not belong to us, and therefore the Apostle sheweth, *Romans* 5. that the grace of God by Christ, in respect of Justification is farre more then the sinne of *Adam* in respect of condemnation. *Sol.*

In the ninth place, Against this imputation of Christs active obedience, is objected two things, *First, That by the same reason our sinnes should be imputed to Christ, and so he constituted a sinner, as we are righteous. And then secondly, This would make two formall causes of our Justification, viz. Remission of sinne, and Imputation of righteousnesse.* *Object. 9.*

But we need not insist long on these; for the first is frequently agitated in the controversie between Papists and Protestants, and is already sufficiently discussed, so that there needs not much after-disquisition. For *Answ.*

First, Though our sinnes be imputed to Christ, yet he cannot properly be called a sinner, because to be a sinner in the common ordinary use of the word, doth denote some inherent pravity and pollution. Thus when sinne is defined to be a transgression of the Law, it supposeth the subject in whom it is to erre from the Rule: Some denominations are from extrinsecall respects; some from intrinsecall motives; and thus for the most part the word sinner connoteth some inherency of defilement: Even as learned men observe, when they speak of the pœnal infirmities of Christs Nature, they say not *contraxit, sed assumpsit*, he assumed them, not contracted them, because to contract an infirmity, doth proper-

ly and rigidly denote so to take a thing, as to take the curse of it, and the natural inherent connexion of sinne, and such penalties. But to assume humane infirmities, that denoteth onely he did partake of them in what manner and measure he pleased: Therefore because the word sinnes doth commonly sound in our ears, as one that hath some pollution inexistent: Hence the consequence of denomination to be a sinner, may justly be denied to imputation of sinne, for this would confound imputation and inhesion, making them the same thing.

But secondly, If we will not manifestly confront plain and direct places of Scripture, we must needs grant, That our sinnes were imputed to him; for though *Isai* 53. 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult.* 1 *Peter* 2. 24. speak not of the word Imputation, yet they speak plainly the sense of that we mean by it in this controversie, *Our sinnes are laid upon him; he bore our sinnes, He was made sinne*; and if this were not so, Why, or, How could Christ die, and that in such an accursed manner by the Law? Death and curses are the wages of sinne; now these fell not upon Christ for his own sinne, therefore it must be for imputed sinne; And thus though that exposition be granted, *he was made sinne for us*, that is, a Sacrifice for sinne, yet it will evince this truth, for he could not be a Sacrifice for sinne, or be a Surety to expiate it, if it were not laid upon him, and he reputed of as so in his sufferings, though in himself holy and unspotted: So that as it is with us, though we have the imputation of Christs righteousnesse, yet inherently we have filth, and the remainders of corruption; so though our sinnes were imputed unto Christ, yet inwardly and inherently he was absolutely holy and innocent.

Thirdly, Whereas its said, That with us imputation and inherency do not differ in reality, but onely *quoad modum*, he that is by imputation righteous, is as truly and as really righteous, as he that is inherently so; and therefore Christ must be as truly and really a sinner by imputation, as if it were by inhesion, its readily answered, That there is not the same reason of imputation of sinne to Christ, as there is of his

his righteousnesse to us; for sinne was imputed to him, onely according to his will, as a Surety to destroy and overcome it; Therefore he bore them, not so as to abide on him, but as to take them away: Even as he touched the unclean person (not as others, who thereby would be made unclean) but to remove and take away the leprosie: But the righteousnesse of Christ is communicated unto us, so as to abide on us, and to constitute us righteous thereby, Christ then being our Surety, and so undertaking the debt of our sinne, to discharge and cancell it, he cannot be thereby reputed a sinner, but a vanquisher and conqueror of sin; and by this we see the weaknesse of that additional and auxiliary Argument, We are by *Adams sinne* imputed, made formally and truly sinners, Why then should not Christ by our sinnes imputed? for every eye may see a vast difference between the imputation of *Adams* sinne to us, and ours to Christ: To Christ it was imputed, so that by this imputation he was to remove it; and he assumed this imputation voluntarily, thereby to destroy it; whereas *Adams* sinne is not only imputed to us by a natural necessity, supposing Gods antecedaneous appointment, but it is also so imputed to us, as to abide on us, to continue upon us. The summe is, That though our sinnes be imputed to Christ, yet he is not thereby constituted a sinner, as if for himself he suffered, or had offended God by this imputation.

SERM. XLV.

More Objections answered, with Antidotes against Prejudice.

ROM. 5.19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

AS for the second branch of the Objection propounded, viz. *That this is to make a two-fold formal cause of our Justification*, I have already sufficiently answered to the pretended absurdity thereof, yet that there may be full and heaped measure, I shall superadde; so that (as they say) *Mantissa loco*, I further answer,

First, That from the Doctrine of the imputation of Christs active obedience, it doth not necessarily follow, that there must be a two-fold formal cause of our Justification; for there are eminent and learned men, who do clearly and fully assert the imputation of Christs active obedience, and withall affirm, That remission of sinne is the effect and fruit of this imputation, adding withall that our whole Justification consists in our remission of sinne, the fruit of imputation, and that imputation of Christs righteousnesse, is not a part, but cause of our Justification; So that with these, this Argument is as easily rejected, as it is obtruded.

That solid and learned Authour *Wallaus* (*Epistol. ad* Durinum.)

pimm.) being asked his judgement about *Piscators* opinion, as also the imputation of Christs active obedience, makes a threefold opinion amongst Writers in this point.

First, Of those who hold the imputation of Christs passive righteousnesse, and the effect thereof, remission of sinne, the first part of Justification; and the imputation of Christs active righteousnesse, the effect whereof is acceptance to eternal life, and this is made the second part of Justification, and this opinion he saith is *Beza's*.

The second opinion holds the imputation of Christs active and passive righteousnesse: The effect whereof is said to be remission of sins, which is our whole Justification. This he ascribeth to *Calvin*.

The third opinion affirmeth, the imputation of Christs passive righteousnesse onely, the effect whereof is said to be the remission of sinnes, which with them also is our whole Justification. And this is *Piscators*.

Now *Wallæus*, though he thinketh the first and the second do not oppose one another, yet he adhereth to the second, as that which he judgeth most simple, and not too subtilly distinguishing causes and effects about Christs death. So that we see by this, that learned men may hold the imputation of Christs active obedience, and yet not make Justification to have a two-fold formal cause: For (say they) *our Justification consists onely in remission of sinnes, which is the effect of the said imputation.* And by the way, you may take notice of the weaknesse of that Argument so much insisted on by many, That *Calvin* did not hold the imputation of Christs active obedience, because he made Justification to consist wholly in remission of sinnes; For it may be granted, That *Calvin* held both, and yet did not contradict himself, making the imputation of Christs active obedience to be the cause; and remission of sinne, which he affirmeth to be our whole Justification, to be the effect thereof. Although (as I have shewed formerly) I cannot see any absurdity in asserting a two-fold formal cause of our Justification, provided that they be not of a different nature and consideration.

To conclude this matter, We do not say, That Christs a-

active obedience and passive, are the formal cause of our Justification; but the matter that is imputed to us thereunto, and indeed to speak properly, if we call them the formall cause, yet we cannot exactly say, of our Justification, but of our Evangelical righteousnesse; for Justification that is an action of God, which requireth a righteousnesse. This righteousnesse being Evangelical, consists of the active and passive obedience of Christ, which by the Covenant of grace is made ours, and God dealeth with us accordingly.

That I may at last come to an end, I shall encounter with the greatest, and most difficult of all their Objections; and if this may receive a true and solid Answer, all the rest will fall in that.

Object. Its this, *The Law bindeth either in respect of obedience, or in respect of penalty; If then there be not obedience to the Law, yet if the penalty be satisfied, then the Law can nomore accuse, then we must needs stand justified. So that they will grant, Christ is our righteousnesse, they acknowledge the Law must be satisfied, and that is* (say they) *by Christs passive obedience; for if Christs death hath taken away the guilt, and yet we not accepted to eternal life, then there must be a* medium *between a man just and unjust, and that when the subject is properly capable of one of the contrary qualities, which is said to be so absurd, as if one thing were required to make a stick streight, and another thing not crooked.*

Answ. Two considerable points are in this Objection, and therefore made two distinct Arguments by some.

The first is concerning the latitude or extension of the obligation of the Law, whether it binde to obedience and punishment disjunctively or copulatively.

The second is, when all the penalty is removed by a satisfactory righteousnesse through Christs death, Whether thereby *ipso facto*, without any imputation of a further righteousnesse, there be not an immediate right to eternal life.

For the former part *Echart* the *Lutheran*, who wrote a peculiar book against *Piscator* in this controversie, doth therein (*Resp. ad decim. Arg.*) shew, That *Piscator* did disclaim that Argument (though most of his fellows fervently pro-

propogne it) and grant, That the Law doth require both of us; obedience, as being our Lord and Master; and punishment, as being our Judge, who is to punish transgressors.

The true and solid Answer indeed to the former part is, That if we speak of man abiding in the state of integrity, so the Law did require onely obedience; for punishment it could not demand any, seeing there was no transgression, but if we consider man fallen, so the Law requireth both obedience and punishment; obedience properly and immediately, but punishment occasionally and indirectly: whereas then its said, That if the Law be satisfied in respect of the penal part, that then it requireth no more, and hath all the righteousnesse it expresseth, that is not upon any terms to be admitted: For Christ while he satisfied the Law in dying for us, did not answer the primary and principal end of the Law, which was *To do this and live*; but by his exact and perfect conformity unto it. So that this Argument proceedeth upon a mistake, as if it were all one to the Law, whether the debt of obedience, or the debt of punishment were paid; for certainly its the debt of obedience the Law doth principally aim at, and when the debt of punishment is paid, the debt of obedience is not thereby abrogated; for if it were so, then a man could not be said still to sinne, because Christ hath satisfied the punishment: But its so clear, that none ever yet denied it, that we do sinne, and whence is that? but because of that debt of obedience, which the Law still requireth. Neither is a man just by a bare suffering of the punishment of the Law, as is to be shewed.

Come we then to that which seemeth to be so hard a knot, that cannot be untied, and that is, *If Christs blood doth cleanse us from all sinne, then there needeth no imputation of a further righteousnesse, for seeing mans nature is a subject immediately susceptible, either of righteousnesse or unrighteousnesse, as the air is of darknesse or light; if so be all his sins be so washed away, that his unrighteousnesse is removed, then it must necessarily follow, he is accounted of by God as righteous.*

This hath exercised the Orthodox, so that they have given different Answers.

Some distinguish of sinnes, There are sinnes of omission and sinnes of commission: *Now* (say they) *by Christs death we are freed from the sinnes of commission, but not omission; the sinnes of omission are covered by the active obedience of Christ.* But I shall not adhere to this, partly, because the Scripture speaks universally, when it saith, our sinnes are purged away by the bloud of Christ; and partly, because in every sinne of commission, there is something of omission. I shall not here discusse that opinion of *Cajetan*, and some other Schoolmen, affirming, *That the formal nature of a sinne of commission, is some real and positive thing:* Onely I shall at this time take it for granted, That in every sinne of commission, let it be conceived never so positive, yet there must be an *debita*, a privative omission of some rectitude that ought to be in it.

Others they distinguish of the guilt of sinne, they make it two-fold, the one is *pœna damni*, as we deserve by it to be excluded from heaven; the other *pœna sensûs*, as by it we deserve all misery to be inflicted upon us: *Now* (say they) *by Christs passive obedience the guilt of sinne*, quoad pœnam sensûs, *is taken away, and by his active obedience the guilt of sinne*, quoad pœnam damni *is removed:* Neither, they say, is this Objection to the contrary, That in every rational creature this two-fold respect of guilt is alwayes conjoyned together, for this is from Gods Decree without, and so they are thereby inseparable, yet for all that distinct. As a Captive that is freed out of prison, and restored to his former honours; or a childe offending his father, upon reconciliation hath his punishment removed, and his right to the inheritance bestowed on him.

In the third place, there is a distinction made concerning Christs death. *It is* (say they) *to be considered either* quâ pœna, *as a punishment*, or quâ actio, *as an action proceeding from the love of God: Now if we consider it in the former respect, so it is said to purge away sins of commission, and the punishment of sense; if in the later, so it takes away the sinnes of omission, and removeth the punishment of losse.* But although there is truth in these distinctions, yet because the Scripture speaks absolutely and plainly in this matter, I think it not convenient to intangle

intangle the truth with these perplexities, nor to make so many distinctions and parcels in what Christ did for us; but look upon the whole course of his obedience, the last act whereof is eminently demonstrated in his death, as that which is the matter of our righteousnesse: So that its not necessary to adapt deliverance from sinne and hell to his death, or interest to eternall life and glory to his obedience: For although its plain, that those are two distinct mercies in themselves, as hath been shewed, and might have been separated one from another; yet now supposing the appointment, and blessed order which God hath established, they can never be disjoyned, and so no wonder if one be put often for the other. Although (I say) this be plain, yet the Scripture speaking of things as they are, and not what they might have been, and so not distinguishing, where yet in intellectual abstractions we may make a difference (as appeareth in expressions about Gods providence respectively to evil actions, attributing them unto God indefinitly, when yet in our understanding, we must necessarily distinguish between the action and the obliquity of the action) its more consonant to the Scripture custome, to say, that by Christ all sinnes under every differential respect, and all guilt under any notion is fully washed away by the Lord Christ. Neither may we limit this either to his obedience in his life, or to his sufferings at his death, but unto the whole course of his subjection unto the Law of God; so that the full and satisfying Answer to this Objection is, That its granted, all sinnes of omission and commission, as also all punishment, whether *damni* or *sensus* is removed by Christs blood; But we say, That by Christs blood, or his death, is not excluded, but necessarily included all his other parts of active obedience. This Interpretation we have already vindicated sufficiently; and certainly that place, *Philip.* 2. where Christs obedience is mentioned even unto the death of the Crosse, doth compell a man to acknowledge that not onely obedience in his death, but all his former antecedaneous obedience even unto death, is part of that satisfactory righteousnesse which Christ obtained for us: So that this

doth still deceive the learned opponents, that they look upon Christs death as oppositely to his active obedience, whereas the Scripture takes notice of it as the last and most signall act of his obedience conjunctly with all his former expressions thereof: So that we are not from thence to compute this Meditory obedience, as if hitherto he had been obeying for himself, but to behold the ultimate consummating thereof in his death. The Summe of all this is, That Christs active obedience disjoyned from his passive, is but part of that righteousnesse the Law requireth of man fallen; and also his passive obedience separated from his active is still but part: Therefore that we may have a compleat and full righteousnesse, it behoved us to have such a Surety who did perform both the debt of obedience, and also the debt of punishment for us.

So that from the Answer thus delivered, there is no necessity of falling upon that debate, Whether there be a middle estate between *Justus* and *Injustus*, (viz.) *non Justus*, yet because its so vehemently urged, I have already said enough to that matter; onely let me adde, That the removing of sinne, and bestowing righteousnesse, is not like the taking away the crookednesse of the line, and making it straight; for its plain, that is done by the same physicall motion; whereas I have shewed, That God might have pardoned sinne to a man, and yet not bestowed upon him such eternall Glory as he hath promised; So that eternall Glory followeth upon the pardon of sinne, not by a naturall causality, or resultancy, but by the gracious appointment and order of God, or if there should be some naturall concomitancy, yet that instance would not fully resemble it, but this, When a man opens the window, and lets in light, the opening of the window, and the introduction of light proceed from two different principles, though the one followeth necessarily upon the other: So that let it be granted, That if sinne be removed, righteousnesse must necessarily come in, yet that doth not follow, that its by the same motion: No, there may be one principle to remove sin as the *obex* and impediment, another to introduce and communicate the righteousnesse it self.

If

If still it be urged, *That a relation of the punishment of the Law is righteousnesse enough;*

I Answer, First, Let us not be afraid, lest we be made too rich, too righteous in Christ, Why should we be so industrious to straighten the righteousnesse Christ hath obtained for us, when the scope of the Scripture is to lengthen and heighten it as much as may be?

Secondly, Even amongst men, none do account a mere suffering of the punishment of the Law, the righteousnesse of it; especially, when there are many superadded favours and priviledges of Grace promised to him, that doth not offend; Christ died not onely to redeem us out of prison, but to invest us with all glorious dignity and honour. Now the taking of the punishment doth not by a natural consequence entitle to all that honour and dignity that the Scripture promiseth.

Lastly, This is not wholly inconsiderable, that if the paiment of the punishment of the Law, be all the righteousnesse Christ hath purchased for us, then we had a more noble and perfect righteousnesse in *Adam*, then Christ hath recovered for us, when yet *Romans* 5. the Apostle makes the Grace and Gift by the second *Adam*, farre transcending the sinne and guilt which came by the first *Adam*. The consequence is clear, because *Adams* righteousnesse was a positive, and full conformity to the Law of God: But the righteousnesse Christ hath purchased for us, according to the sense of the Opponents, is onely a penal righteousnesse; The punishment is thereby removed, but obedience is not introduced.

Thus we have examined wherein the strength of those that dissent in this Point doth lie: Did I apprehend any thing else material, I would not wave the discussion of it, for its truth and the glory of Christ that we should aim at in these conflicts.

Now because not Arguments, but prejudices do sometimes obstruct the truth, I shall conclude all with some few Antidotes against them. As first, *In the deciding of this controversie attend not the specious, and fair pretences of humane reason, for every*

Antidotes against prejudice.

every thing of Christ is paradoxall to that; His Natures, his Offices, and his Passive Obedience in a satisfactory way to Gods Justice; and as the *Socinians* decry it as a thing against reason, for an innocent man to suffer in stead of a nocent; so they do not lesse exclaim against a righteousnesse, because of anothers righteousnesse. This both Papists and *Socinians* rise up against, whereas we do not say, That a beleever is righteous, because Christ is righteous, but because his righteousnesse, being our Surety, is made ours by Gods accounting of it to us; neither is it against presidents either in Scripture or humane Authours, to have vertuous and laudable actions of some men, meritorious unto others that relate unto them.

Secondly, *Consider whether this Doctrine doth not indeed give more Glory and Honour to Christ*; For seeing he came into the world as a Surety for us, and so not under his own personall obligation, but a voluntary assumed one, The more he did for us, the greater was his Glory: and as it would not be honour enough to him to say, He died for our good, unlesse we affirm, in our stead: So neither that he obeyed the Law for our good, unlesse also we affirm, in our room.

Thirdly, *Let this be seriously weighed, as hath been often hinted, Whether the same Arguments that destroy the active obedience of Christ, would not, if managed in a further way seem to overthrow the passive.* Its farre from me to charge such consequences upon many of the learned Antagonists, onely its seriously to be considered, Whether that necessity which is pleaded for by the Orthodox in respect of Christs satisfactory passive obedience, will not also as strongly interpose for his active: Doth not the Law of God, the justice of God equally relate to one as well as the other? And

Lastly, Doth not this provide more for the full consolation of a beleever? Are a godly mans temptations only about the punishment of the Law, who shall satisfie that, and not for the pure and holy obligation of the Law, who shall answer that? Let us be afraid to take off in the least manner, either from Christs glory, or the beleevers comfort.

FINIS.

AN ALPHABETICAL TABLE.

A.

Abraham.

IF Gods command to him to kill his son, how just it was, p. 30
That men are justified as he was, 197

Accept.

Gods *Accepting* of man two-fold, General, Special, 195

Accusations.

Accusations from God, the Law, the Devil, Conscience and Men, all taken off by Justification, 125

Action, Act.

Whether any one Mediatory *Action* of Christ sufficiently satisfied God, 93,413
That all the *Actions* of unregenerate men are sins, 187

A

Adam.

The similitude and dissimilitude between *Adam* and Christ, 348
Whether *Adam* did or could have transgressed the Moral Law, 352
Different opinions about our being sinners by *Adam*, 354
Adams sin ours; not only by Propagation but Imputation, 355

Afflictions.

The necessity of them, 34
Their usefulness, 35

Anger.

Of the *Anger* of God against sin, 55

Appetite.

Of spiritual *Appetite* to the doctrine of Justification, 161

B

Baptism.

OF *Baptism*, 144

C

Christ.

Christs Obedience, whether it were due to God for himself, or for us, 89

See *Obedience.*

Its infinite worth.

See *Satisfaction.*

Whether the infinite Dignity derived from the Person of *Christ* to his Actions be a Physical entity, or a Moral relation, 97

Of *Christs* Active and Passive Obeence. See *Obedience* and *Imputation.*

Of *Christ crucified.*

It was a demonstration of Gods justice and anger against sin, 53

Christs Title to Kingdoms while in the state of Humiliation discussed 390

Command. See *Law.*

Condition.

Whether works are a *Condition*, or a *Causa sine qua non* of a mans Justification. 217

The nature of a *Condition* in a Covenant. 228

That it is a *Causa cum qua*, not a *Causa sine qua non*, *ibid.*

Conscience.

Of the *Consciences* perswasion of Gods Righteousnes, 7

The accusations of *Conscience*, 127

Of peace of *Conscience*, 128

Corruption of Nature.

Of the *Corruption* of all men, 178

Covenant.

Of the *Covenant* of God made with *Adam*, and how far all mankinde was included in it, 355

Of the *Covenant* between God and Christ. 376

D

Death.

THE *Death* of Christ sufficient for all, 71

Whether it was Natural or meerly Miraculous, 426

Desertion.

Of Christs *Desertion*, 323

Devil.

Devil.

That the *Devil* is Gods jailor, 69

Distinctions.

Distinctions about Justification examined and attested or cashier'd, viz.

A Justification
Active, Passive, 136

Lawful, Sinful, 137

Absolute, Comparative, 139

In foro Dei / *Conscientiæ*, ibid.

Universal, Particular, 141

Of the Person, ibid.

The Cause
Before God, 142
Men, 218

Baptismal persons grown up, 143

From Eternity, Declarative in time, 146

Absolute, Conditional, ibid

First, 147
Second, 151

Justitia Legis / *Per Legem*, 19

Also *Distinguish* between

The works of that Righteousness the Law requireth, And the Righteousnesse of works, 214

Christs fulfilling the Law, And our own Evangelical Obedience, 232

A Legal / Servile Obedience, 412

A perfection, and The perfection of the whole, ib.

Christs obedience it self, & The manner of Application of it, 436

And the Office of Christ, And the Righteousness he merited by it, ibid.

Absolute pardon, and Acquited by Satisfaction, 278

Divine Nature.

The *Divine Nature* in Christ did not alwayes put forth such glorious and resplendent effects as it could do, 321

E

Effects.

THe *Effects* of Gods Mercy and Justice, 17

Eternity.

Eternity not of the Essence of death, but accidental, 73

F

Faith.

Faith as a work excluded from justifying, 122
Of a weak *Faith*, and a strong, 132
How *Faith* justifieth, whether in an active or passive sense, 137, 224, 250
The difference between *Faith* and other graces in respect of Justification, 223
Of the Instrumentality of *Faith*, 224
That *Faith* as it is a work, or the 7d *credere*, is not imputed to us for our Justification, 238
Faith imputed for Righteousness, the several interpretations of it, 241
The true one asserted, 251
Of the object of *Faith*, Adequate and General, Principal and Specifical. 243
Of *Faiths* two-fold effect. 244
Whether *Faith* may be called an instrumental cause of Justification, 256.
Whether Justification be a natural effect of *believing*, or comes it meerly by the Divine appointment or institution of God, 259

Forgiving. Forgiveness.

Of Gods *Forgiving* and mans, and how they differ, 67
That the whole nature of Justification is not comprehended in *Forgiveness* of sin, 262.

Form.

Whether the *Form* or Nature of Justification be twofold, 133

Forsaken.

In what sense Christ was *Forsaken*, 322

G

GOD.

GOD without Accidents, Parts, or Composition, 13
His absolute Power, 14
And Soveraignty, 30, 31
His Righteousness.

See *Righteousness.*

Of the just and righteous Nature of *God* punishing sin, 104
Whether he might pardon sin without Satisfaction, 14
His love to Righteousness in the creature, 19

His will a Law to himself, 33
Of his willing of sin, 40

Good.

Good things Natural, Positive, } 13

Good Works, See *Works*.

H

Habitual.

Habitual or inherent Righteousness doth not justifie us before God. 148

Hard.

Hard things for men to determine, 15

Harden.

Of Gods *Hardning* mens hearts, 44

Heathen.

That the best works of *Heathens* are sins, 187
Whether they may be saved dying such, 192

I

James.

James and *Paul* reconciled, 237

Immanent.

Whether Justification be an *Immanent* or transient act of Gods, 137

Imputed.

That Justification though *Imputed* yet is a real priviledge, 135
How faith is said to be *Imputed*, 141
That a believers righteousness is *Imputed*, 285, 295
The signification of the word *Imputed*, 286
Sinne may be *Imputed* two wayes, 287
How many wayes good may be *Imputed* to a man, 288

Imputation.

Of the *Imputation* of Christs righteousness.
The need we have of it, there being nothing in us wherefore God should account us righteous, 289
But the contrary, ib.
That it is relative, 290
Yet real, ibid.

Concerning *Imputation*:
1. The Thing, 2. The Cause, 3. The Effect, } 291
Its term from which, and to which, 292
That its contrary to carnal reason, yet acknowledged by all Christians in one sense or other, except Socinians. 293

That it makes not a man as righteous as Christ, 294
Christs righteousness not the form of our Justification, but Gods *Imputing* of it, ib.
Objections against *Imputed* righteousness, answered, 305
Of the *Imputation* of Christs sufferings for our Justification, 306
And of his active obedience, 338
The Arguments against it answered, 382

Impotency.

Of mans utter *Impotency* in respect of Justification, 190

Israelites.

The *Israelites* stole not from the Egyptians, 31

Justice. See *Righteousness.*

Justice.

The *Justice* of God declared in our Justification, 91
Fully satisfied with Christs obedience, 95
Whether punitive *Justice* was so natural to God, supposing sin to be, that he could not remit it without satisfaction, 104

Justified.

None *Justified* without a compleat righteousness.
That Christ was not, nor needed to be *Justified*, 124
That a man is but once *Justified*, though often pardoned, 267
That *Justified* persons are justified alike, 231,247
That a man is *Justified* in the same manner and way in the whole progress of his life, as at first, 148
That a man is not *Justified* by inherent righteousness, 148
Nor by works of the Law done by meer natural men, 187
Nor by the works of the Law done by the grace of God, 196,207
Nor by works as a Condition, or a *Causa sine qua non*, 217
Nor by the Imputation of faith as it is a work, or the τὸ *credere*.
The time when a man is *Justified*, 122

Justification.

The Causes of *Justification*, 50
The final Cause distributed into the *finis cujus*, and the *finis cui*, 50,80
What *Justification* is, 115
The signification of the word, ib.
That its to absolve a man, and not put righteousness into him, 116
Yet never is without the Sanctification of our Natures, 122
Justification by the Law a *non ens* 222,
By Christ a supernatural way, 168
That the whole nature of *Justification* is not comprehended in forgiveness of sin, 262,266
The Description of *Justification*, 122
Whether it be an Immanent, or a transient Act of Gods, ib.

The

The time when a man is *Justified*, 122
Not from Eternity, but when he believes, ibid.
God, i.e. all the three Persons *Justifieth* a man, ib.
The freeness of it, ib.
Meritorious Cause of it, ib.
Extent of it, 125
Answering all accusations, ib.
Whether Gods act of *Justifying* be nothing but the grant of it in the Gospel, 129
In what sense it may be said that *Justification* is compleated at one instant, and in what sense iterated 130
Whether to assert the Imputation of Christs two righteousnesses do not inferre two formal Causes of our *Justification*, 445

L

Law.

THe accusations of it, 126
In what sense Justification is denied to the works of the *Law*, 200
Reasons why it cannot justifie, 207
That the *Law* required only an external righteousnes, to which was promised a temporal reward, refuted, 200
That the works of the *Law* to which justification is denied, is meant only of the Ceremonial Law, refuted, 201
The usefulness and excellency of the *Law*, 213
Of Christs obedience to the *Law*. See *Obedience*.
Whether Christ fulfilled the *Law* obedientially for himself, or for us. 358,402.420
How it could be called a *Law* or command imposed on Christ to die for us, seeing his death did depend on the wicked and corrupt wils of other men, 401
That we are bound to obey the *Law* notwithstanding Christs obeying of it, 428

M

Mankinde.

ALl *Mankinde* plunged in sin, and cursed by the Law, 52
And devoid of righteousnesse, 180,182

Merited.

Whether Christ *Merited* for himself, 421

Misery.

The *Misery* of all men by Nature, 182

N

Natural.

NAtural, 104
Natural vindicative justice natural in God, 108
Natural men are spiritually unclean both in their Persons and Actions, 186

Necessity.

Necessity distinguished, 204
Two-fold, 418

O

Obedience.

Obedience of Christ, how far for himself, and how far for us, 89,386
A censure, and yet an allowance of the tearms Active and Passive *Obedience*, 341
That the *Obedience* of Christ is not to be limited to that which Divines call Passive, 330

Passive Obedience, See *Sufferings*.

That Christ while on the earth, did truly and properly *Obey* God the Father, 330
The difficulty of understanding it. ibid.
In what sense he did so, 333
Of the Imputation of Christs *active Obedience*, 338
The Novelty and Pedegree of the contrary Doctrine to the Imputation of Christs *Active Obedience*, 341
And the Differences that are among the adversaries to it about it, 343
Also the Differences that are among the Asserters of it, about it, 346
Arguments for it, 347
Arguments against it, answered, 382
Whether Christ was bound to *Obey* his Parents and the Civil Magistrate, as other men are, 388
That in that Law of *Obeying* Parents there was a great difference between Christ and other men, 388
The necessity of both Active and Passive *Obedience*, 411

Objections.

Objections against the Imputation of Christs righteousness answered, 305
And against the Imputation of his sufferings in particular. 312
And against the Imputation of his active obedience, 382

Obligation.

An *Obligation* may arise two wayes

Omission.

Of sins of *Omission*, 169

Original.

Of *Original* corruption, 182

Own.

Of mans *Own* righteousnesse, how prone all men are to set up a righteousness of their *Own*, 157

P

Pardon.

Wherein *Pardon* of sinne and justification differ, 266

That it is but a part of justification, ibid

That a man is often *Pardoned*, but not often justified, 267

Paul.

Paul and *James* reconciled, 237, 151

Permission.

Of Gods *Permissive* will about sin, 40

Political.

Of *Political* righteousnes. 6

Poverty.

How the righteous may be in a *Poor* Condition, and yet God be righteous, 34

Prayer.

When we *Pray* to God not to deal with us according to his justice, we must not mean Gods Attribute of justnes, but the effects of it, 15

Prejudice.

Antidotes against *Prejudice*, 455

Price.

The *Price* Christ paid sufficient for all, 71

And yet God is just though he save not all, 72

See *Satisfaction.*

Promises.

Promises Absolute, } 34
Conditional, }

Providence.

The *Providence* of God about sinne, 39

Of Gods *Providential* Governments of the world, 7

Punish.

Punishment of sinne proceeds from the Nature of God. 109

R

Real.

THat justification though imputed is a *Real* priviledge, 135

Redemption.

Why it was necessary our *Redemption* should be by way of justice, 101

Regeneration.

Of Baptismal *Regeneration*, 144

Remission.

See *Pardon.*

Repent.

Whether Christ *Repented* and believed for us, 123

Reproaches.

Reproaches, Comfort against them, 128

Reward.

Of *Reward* of merit, and of promise, 17

Righteousness.

Righteousness in God.

Its divers acceptations, 3

Is two-fold, Universal And Particular, 4

His particular *Righteousness* threefold.

Righteousness properly attributed unto God, 5,7

We judge of it by his Word, 10

That it is essential unto him, 12

Is the Rule of all *Righteousness*, 13

It taken three wayes in Scripture, 15

That a corrective or vindicative justice in God is Natural and Essential to him, 108

That Gods *Righteousness* appeareth in three things, 23

Is vindicated from many Objections, 29.to.48

How many wayes its taken in *Pauls* Epistles, 51

Of the *Righteousness* of Gods word and works, 81

That the *Righteousness* in Angels and men is a demonstration of Gods Righteousnesse, 8

Of the *Righteousness* that is in Gods people, 20

Its Nature, Parts, 21,22

Gods love to them, 24

That all men have lost their *Righteousness* in which man was created, 280

That the *Righteousness* of the best will not justifie them, 24

The necessity of having a *Righteousness*, 281,285

Righteousness of Christ.

Why its call'd the *Righteousness* of God, 156,300

The perfection of it, 412

Whether it being imputed make us formally *Righteous*, 434

Whether the *Righteousness* of justification and sin, are naturally contraries, 285

See *Satisfaction* and *Obedience.*

S

Sacraments.

The efficacy of *Sacraments*, 145

Satisfaction.

Of Christs *Satisfaction* to Divine Justice.

Arguments for it, 57
It leſſens not the grace of God 65
Hinders not but neceſſitates good works in us, 68
Who was *Satisfied*, or received the price? 69, 87
The difference between merit and *Satisfaction*, 85
What is required to proper *Satisfaction*, 68
That Christs *Satisfaction* had all the properties of merit and *Satisfaction*, 85
Was copious } 91
And plentiful }
Perfect, 93
And more *Satisfactory* to God then all the ſinnes of the Elect are diſpleaſing to him, 95
Whence the obedience of Christ became ſo *Satisfactory*, 97
Whether Christ paid the *Idem* or the *Tantundem* of what was due, 441

Satisfie.

That no meer creature could *Satisfie* Gods Juſtice for ſinne, 99

Scripture.

Scriptures ſeemingly oppoſite to each other about Gods righteouſneſs reconciled, 29

Seek.

Why God *Seeks* to man firſt to be reconciled, 56

Sin.

Gods hatred of *ſin*, 23
Gods providence about it, 39
That *ſin* is aggravated by Christs Death, 78
Sorrow for *ſin*, 131
The *malum Creaturæ*, And } 96
The *malum Dei* of *ſin*, }
Its infinite Evil and Guilt, 102
Whether God could pardon it without Satisfaction, 104 106
Sins of { Omiſſion, 169
{ Commiſſion, 173
That God ſees *ſin* in believers, 433

Sins.

Whether the imputation of our

sins to Christ make him a sinner, 445

Socinian.

The great *Socinian* Errors, 56

Soul.

Of Christs sufferings in his *Soul*, 324

State.

The *State* of all by Nature, 54

Steal.

That the Israelites did not *Steal* from the Egyptians, 31

Subject.

That Christ was truly and properly *Subject* to the Law of God both Generall and Particular. And that he suffered in Obedience both to the Naturall and Positive Law of God, 392

Sufferings.

Of Christs *Sufferings*, 73,306
That it was not needful he should *Suffer* the eternal torments of hell 73
How what he could not *Suffer* was made up, ibid
The greatnes of his *Sufferings*, 73, 306
That he *Suffered* in his Soul through Gods displeasure at our sins, 73,306
That he *Suffered* in his soul as well as his body, 316, 324
Whether Christ *Suffered* the same that we should have done, or that which was equivalent, 74
How due and voluntary his *Sufferings* were, 89
That Christs Death was a peculiar, extraordinary thing, 311
The several Errors of men about Christs *Sufferings*, 317
The Difference between Christs *Sufferings*, Agonies, and ours, 319
That the fear of Death was not the eminentest part of his *Suffering* in his soul: but a want of the sense and feeling of Gods favour and help, 320
How far and in what respects Christ was of God forsaken, 322
That in his *Sufferings* he sustained two Persons, his own, and ours, 324

Surety.

That Christ was our *Surety*, 373
And what he was to do as such ibid. & 375

T

Trinity.

How all three Persons in the *Trinity* were concern'd in Satisfaction for sin, 69,75

V

Union.

Union with Christ, 231

W

Will.

The *Will* of God about sinne, 40

Word of God.

Its Purity and Holiness, 23

Works.

The necessity of good *Works*, notwithstanding Christs Satisfaction, 65

That its impossible to be justified by the Covenant of *Works*, or *Works* of the Law, 200, 207, & 222

Or by such *Works* as are done by the grace of God, 203, 219

Or by *Works* as a Condition, or *Causa sine qua non*, 217

That good *Works* follow Justification, 229

Go before Salvation, 230

And need a Justification, 232

World.

Of Gods providential Government of the *World*, 7

Wrath, See *Anger.*

Z

Zaleucus.

Zaleucus a story of him, 69

FINIS.

Errata.

Pag. 3. l. 1. r. *Nyx*. p. 8. l. ult. r. *punitive*. p. 12. l. 37. for *that* r. *yet*. p. 52. l. 28. r. *punitive*. p. 54. l. 12. r. *desert*. p. 55. l. 9. for *relation* r. *rebellion*. p. 87. l. 31. r. *its not absurd*. p. 99. l. 19. r. *Stancarus*. & l. 36. next *Jesuite*, adde *in his*. p. 104. l. 14. r. *punitive*. p. 115. l. 5. r. *Hobs de cive*. p. 140. l. 12. r. *Just* twice. p. 149. l. 2. r. *Just*. p. 156. l. 16. r. *Idea*. p. 173. l. ult. for *after from*. p. 188. l. 4. dele *thongo*. p. 200. l. 22. *to think*. p. 223. l. 24. for *not* r. *and that*. p. 237. l. 11. r. *that said*. p. 325. l. 16. r. *meer*. p. 352. l. 10. for *distinct* r. *distrust*. & l. 29. r. *done it*.